



MINUTE

BY

COLONEL HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJAH OF BIKANER,

G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E., A.-D.-C.,

ON CERTAIN POINTS RELATING TO THE INDIAN STATES AND THEIR RULERS.

1915.

CONTENTS.

	PARAS.	PAGES.
1. Preliminary remarks	1-6	1-2
2. The general question of the honour, dignity, privileges, and prestige of Ruling Princes and Chiefs and their Treaties and Engagements, &c., with the British Government	7-24	2-13
3. Suggested Conference and Committees ...	25	13-14
4. Rank and Precedence of Ruling Princes ...	26-66	14-27
5. Certain comparisons shewing changes in recent years adversely affecting Ruling Princes	67	27-38
6. Certain proposals concerning the Heirs, sons, and other near relations of Ruling Princes	68	38
7. Certain miscellaneous proposals ...	69-74	39-40
8. Minority Administrations ...	75	40-43
9. The formation of a Council of Princes ...	76-85	43-46
10. Open Commissions in the Army ...	86	46-47
11. Subjects of Indian States to be eligible for the Public Services in British India ...	87	47
12. Summary	88	47

Minute by

*Colonel His Highness the Maharajah of Bikaner, G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E., A.-D.-C.,
on certain points relating to the Indian States and their Rulers.*

“We hereby announce to the Native Princes of India that all Treaties” .
“and Engagements made with them by or under the authority of”
“the Honourable East India Company are by Us accepted, and will be”
“scrupulously maintained: and We look for the like observance on their”
“part.”

* * *

“We shall respect the Rights, Dignity and Honor of Native Princes as”
“Our own:” – *Proclamation by Her late Imperial Majesty
Queen Victoria in Council to the Princes, Chiefs, and People of India, 1858.*

“To all my Feudatories and Subjects throughout India I renew”
“the assurance of my regard for their liberties, of respect for their”
“dignities and rights, of interest in their advancement, and of devotion”
“to their welfare, which are the supreme aim and object of my rule, ...”
– *Message of His late Imperial Majesty King Edward VII, 1903.*

“Finally I rejoice to have this opportunity of renewing in my own”
“person those assurances which have been given you by my revered”
“predecessors of the maintenance of your rights and privileges”
– *His Imperial Majesty's speech at the Imperial Coronation Durbar at
Delhi, 1911.*

“Paramount regard for treaty, faith and pledges, word of rulers, and”
“peoples is the common heritage of England and India.”
– *Message of His Imperial Majesty the King-Emperor to the Princes and
peoples of India at the outbreak of the Great European War, 1914.*

When by the grace of God the present War – the greatest known to History – has been brought to a victorious and glorious conclusion, His Imperial Majesty's Overseas Dominions – including the great Indian Empire – are sure to be accorded their proper places in the closer-knit scheme of Greater Britain, a result of which in the words of Mr. Bonar Law's recent speech “would be to weld the Empire with unbreakable bonds.” There must come enhanced sympathy and goodwill and therefore more intelligent co-ordination between the centre and the peripheries in consequence of the honourable and proud part played by the various countries and peoples owing common allegiance to the Sovereign. It cannot but be hoped that the gracious enduring sympathy of the King-Emperor personally and the far-sighted statesmanship of His Imperial Majesty's Ministers in England and Representatives and High Officers in the various parts of the British Empire, will, in a generous and masterly manner, be brought into play towards reconciling all interests and satisfying the legitimate expectations and aspirations of all classes and communities.

2. These expectations are not entertained as the price of the loyalty of the various classes and nationalities of His Imperial Majesty's numerous subjects but as the natural outcome of the ties which bind the different parts of the Empire, and in Imperial recognition of the services which it has been their privilege so spontaneously and joyfully to have rendered at a time of the most serious crisis which England and the British Empire have ever had to face.

3. India, too, waits and confidently hopes that she will receive her due share of such Imperial favours and bounties, and the great and important Order of the Ruling Princes and Chiefs of India, though not technically a part of British India proper, yet by virtue of enjoying the protection of His Imperial Majesty and yielding to no one—Britishers, Indians, or Colonials—in devotion and veneration, and loyalty and attachment, to their beloved Emperor, may reasonably entertain the hope that their difficulties and anxieties also will be seriously examined and dispelled.

4. I hope it will not be considered presumptuous on my part to attempt to indicate in this connection some lines along which something might be done to bring about certain changes, which, I venture to state, will still further cement the bonds connecting the Ruling Princes with the Empire of which, Lord Curzon stated in his speech at the Installation Durbar at Bahawalpur in 1903, they “are no longer detached appendages ... but its participators and instruments. They have ceased to be the architectural adornments of the Imperial edifice, and have become the pillars that help to sustain the main roof.”

5. As one owing unswerving allegiance to the King-Emperor and having had the further honour of serving personally on the Staff of His Imperial Majesty for the last 13 years, and as a sincere friend and well-wisher of the British Government, I feel that I would be failing in my plain duty to my Sovereign and to His Imperial Majesty's Representative in India if I did not bring forward certain facts and points for early and favourable consideration, with the conviction that by doing so I am rendering a humble service however small.

6. An eminent political officer, the late Colonel P. W. Powlett, c.b., c.s.i., in his *Gazetteer of Bikaner*, whilst mentioning the services rendered by my Ancestors to the Moghul Emperors, states that the Maharajah of Bikaner, after the Maharajah of Jaipur, was “the Hindu of highest rank at the Court of Akbar,” and we have in our archives a treasured letter addressed to one of my Ancestors—Maharajah Sur Singhji—from the Moghul Court of the Emperor Jahangir in which is written:—

“Your letter is received. We understand fully what you want.”

“... ... You may write whatever you have to say without hesitation.”

Times are different now in that Fate does not afford us as many opportunities, nor even when such opportunities are afforded are other circumstances always so favourable; and it is not for me to speak here of the services rendered in more recent times by my House and State to the Sovereign and the British Government. Whilst confident that my action and motives in submitting this Minute will not be misunderstood, and whilst begging to be forgiven for any shortcomings which may be met with in these pages, I also would here ask for permission to “write whatever I have to say without hesitation.”

7. The points which I venture to put forward relate to the *izzat*,

privileges, and prestige of the Rulers of Indian States and to other matters closely affecting them, their States, and their Administration.

8. My official, as distinct from ceremonial, connection with Viceroys and the Government of India dates back only to the time of Lord Curzon. In his book *India under Curzon and After*, Mr. Lovat Fraser writes, "One great service was rendered by Lord Curzon to the princes and chiefs of India, greater, perhaps, than they themselves realise. He brought them out of comparative seclusion, and by encouraging closer intimacy with the Government, and with each other, produced among them a more vivid consciousness of the great part they have to play in the wider arena of Indian affairs." In Lord Minto's time a really liberal and sympathetic policy was established and a great deal was done then to make us and our States happy. During the present Viceroyalty, Lord Hardinge—who has in many ways clearly and consistently demonstrated his friendship and sympathy for us, and his interest and solicitude for our well-being and prosperity—has not only followed, but has considerably developed and strengthened, his predecessor's policy, with the result that never in recent times were more cordial or happier personal relations cultivated or maintained with the Ruling Princes and Chiefs, or greater courtesy and consideration extended to them, by a Viceroy than at the present day—all of which have elicited feelings of our deep gratitude. There is thus, as is the case in British India also, probably not one Ruling Prince or Chief who does not differentiate between the personal aims of His Imperial Majesty's distinguished Representative out here and the attitude and acts of some permanent officials in India, or who does not realise that the points, which it is intended to deal with here, have arisen in consequence of a policy and traditions which have slowly grown up and been handed down in the past, especially during the last decade or so. And it may also be taken that we all realise that such policy and traditions could not be easily overridden or effaced at a stroke. A precedent is set up when once a privilege is withdrawn or suspended, or an established practice discontinued or departed from, rendering chances of its ultimate restoration comparatively remote and difficult. We are gratefully aware that whenever we do approach, and make an official representation to, the Viceroy personally, the fullest justice is promptly and generously done in spite of any previous rulings which may have been issued in a case—through whatever causes—by Government. Some of us have had personal experience of old and clearly established customs and courtesies and honours having been changed and even entirely discontinued—often during our minorities—in, what appeared to us, an arbitrary manner and without justification or due regard to past usage and facts—which, as in my own case in 1913, were rectified and restored on such official representation to His Excellency the Viceroy. But owing to various reasons it is neither feasible nor desirable always to approach a Viceroy on every such point that may arise, and above all the fact remains that questions are dealt with and disposed of by some of the high officials of Government in the manner indicated above.

9. If therefore for purposes of adequately putting forward our case some comment upon official acts and tendencies has been called for, such criticism has been resorted to with extreme reluctance and in no unfriendly spirit, and it is hoped it will not be taken as implying sweeping assertions or broadcast allegations against the whole body of officials, for we can count several political and other officers of Government amongst our personal friends who are in full sympathy with us and our States. To avoid any misinterpretation it also seems desirable to add that when dealing with questions relating to

the *izzat* and privileges of Ruling Princes and Chiefs, it has been found imperative, with a view to emphasising our claims, to quote certain terms and phrases applied to us in our past Treaties as well as official documents and communications, and also by certain acknowledged authorities. This, it need hardly be said, has not been done in any vainglorious or immodest spirit. And similarly it should be stated that it is for purposes of making clear the distinction (referred to in paras 58 to 65) between Ruling *Princes* and Ruling *Chiefs*, that the term *Princes* has been consistently employed in this Minute when referring specifically to the former.

10. This is mentioned particularly because I have myself heard it suggested by some officials that some of the Ruling Princes have got an inordinate idea of their position and dignity ; that some of them imagine themselves as the equals of the King-Emperor Himself ! No calumny could be more unfounded, no libel more gross, and no imputation more unfair or more calculated to evoke our righteous indignation, than that implied by such irresponsible observations. The King-Emperor stands pre-eminent on a pedestal at once sacred, exalted, and unapproachable, and no one in his senses can even pretend to anything even approximately verging upon equality with the Sovereign – the Fountain Head of all honour – in Whose service we all are, and have always been, ready to shed the last drop of our blood. Nor, it can be safely asserted, has any one the least idea of disputing the political relationship existing between the Paramount Power and our States. We are content to remain in the honourable position originally allotted to us in the Empire. Lord Curzon in his speech at the Delhi Durbar of 1903, speaking of 'the Princes of India' said, "It is difficult to give them more than they already enjoy, and impossible to add to a security whose inviolability is beyond dispute", and at a Public Durbar at Jammu in 1905 he also said, "As one who has represented the Sovereign Power for an unusual length of time in India, I can speak with some right to be heard when I say that anything that enhances the security or adds to the dignity of the Indian Princes is, above all things, welcome to the British Government." As in the case of other self-respecting nations and communities, honour and dignity to us is everything and prized more highly than life itself. The late Sir William Lee-Warner, G. C. S. I. – who served both in the Political Department in India and on the India Office Council in England – in his book *The Native States of India* says, ".... the map of British India is to-day studded with principalities in subordinate alliance with the paramount and protecting power, and it is the declared object of the Imperial Government that they should grow with the growth of the British territories and strengthen with their strength." And as under Divine Providence the might and glory of the great British Empire – with which the destinies and interests of the Indian States and their Rulers are indissolubly linked – increases, we even look for a fresh and further enhancement of our *izzat*. But what above all we are really anxious for is that at least such honour, position, and dignity as we are entitled to enjoy since our first connection with the British Government should be generously and unstintedly recognised and maintained, for which we have only the Sovereign, His Viceroy, and His Imperial Majesty's Government to look up to.

11. The quotations referred to will also, it is hoped, show the fallacy of another official view which too, I have heard seriously expounded, namely, that as a matter of fact the position and status of the 'Chiefs' were not really different to that of some of the Peers of the British Realm – high and honourable though we fully realize the latter's position in the United Kingdom is.

12. In marked contrast with the policy enunciated, and the inviolable pledges given in the, now historic, Proclamation of 1858 of Her late Imperial Majesty Queen Victoria, universally acclaimed in this Country as the 'Magna Charta of India'—pledges which have since been graciously ratified by Their Imperial Majesties the late King Edward and the present King-Emperor, and emphasised by an eminent British statesman, Lord Morley, when he was Secretary of State for India, in the following terms :—

" the noble promise in Queen Victoria's Proclamation of 1858—a promise of which every Englishman ought to be for ever proud if he tries to adhere to it, and ashamed if he tries to betray or to mock it—... ... "

(*Second Reading of Indian Councils Bill, House of Lords, February 23, 1909*)—in marked contrast with these, and contrary to the clear and direct provisions, contents, and spirit of the various Treaties, Engagements, &c., which will be found to be referred to hereafter, is the tendency exhibited by certain so-called authorities on matters relating to Indian States, who have not hesitated to pronounce as obsolete the Treaties which exist between the British Government and the Ruling Princes and Chiefs. As some of the high officers of Government must be fully aware, this tendency to treat solemn Engagements as no longer binding has for some time past had a very disquieting effect upon the States.

13. At a time like the present when Great Britain is waging a titanic war chiefly because an unscrupulous Nation has chosen to regard a sacred Treaty as 'a mere scrap of paper'—for principles which have been nobly followed by Great Britain in its past dealings everywhere throughout the World—it will be the misfortune only of the Indian States, if steps are not taken to remove our existing apprehensions in this respect and to bring about a change in the policy which owes its inception to a certain school of thought. The following extracts from *The Native States of India* by Sir William Lee-Warner which bear on the subject may appropriately be quoted :—

" The corpus of Indian treaties. ... these solemn documents

... have acquired the most formal recognition of Parliament. The position of "Trustees for the Crown of the United Kingdom" was assigned to the Company in 1833, by Statute 3 and 4 William IV. cap. LXXXV. ; and, when the trust administration of India was determined or ended by the Act of 1858, Statute 21 and 22 Vic. cap. cxi., §67 enacted that "all treaties made by the said Company shall be binding on Her Majesty." The Native states, no less than the territories in the possession or under the Government of the East India Company, thus passed into the safe keeping of the British nation. "

" Direct responsibility of the supreme Government for treaties. The binding force of a formal treaty or compact between states is fully recognised by the Government of India, "

" Leading dates of Indian treaties. The care taken in the execution of these compacts affords some measure of the great respect paid to them. they require the most generous construction of which the circumstances permit. Their validity has been solemnly recognised by Parliament, and they are surrounded with all the solemnity that full deliberation, formality, and the ratification of the representative of His Majesty can confer on them. "

And although from the general tenor of the observations in his book, Mr. Lovat Fraser cannot on the whole be said to be sympathetic with the States, the

following extracts in this connection are significant :—

“ The obligations incurred are, however, mutual to this degree, that British rule tends to depend more than ever upon the loyal support and allegiance of the native states. The interests of the Sovereign Power and of the princes and chiefs grow more nearly identical as the years pass. Both are concerned to preserve the existing system, the generous loyalty of the princes and chiefs to the British Crown is a solid factor which helps materially to preserve stability at a time when such assurances are of the utmost value. The Viceroy and the Government of India have no more imperative duty than that of maintaining good relations with the native states.”

“In one respect the attitude of the Government of India towards native states requires frank comment. I have shown, in this rough sketch of the position, that in the case of many of the states the rights of the British Government are to some extent determined by treaties, which are occasionally antiquated. The development of the British system has rendered the provisions of some of these treaties a little irksome, and there are times when they block the completion of Government projects. New Departments arise, and inaugurate new policies which pay very little regard to the prescriptive rights of native states. A growing corollary of the theory of Imperial partnership seems to be that the Government is not necessarily bound by treaties which are considered obsolete ; or, on occasion, the Government will only admit the validity of treaties with great reluctance, after compelling native states to fight in defence of treaty rights which ought to have been recognised without demur ; or, to mention another situation which sometimes arises, the Government will shelter themselves behind the letter of a clause, taking the possibly disputable opinion of their law officers as final, and will pay no regard to the manifest spirit in which the treaty was originally framed. In all such controversies the states fight at a severe disadvantage.”

“The growth of such an attitude on the part of the Government cannot be too strongly deprecated. All treaties with native states, unless abrogated by mutual consent, should be binding on both parties, and there should be no attempt by departmental officials to evade them by indirect methods. To Ministers with a policy these treaties may seem of little moment, but to the states they are sacred. At any cost they should be upheld. The rounding off of a great scheme may seem urgently desirable, and the opposition of a state may seem frivolous ; but a far greater principle is really at stake, and that is the honour of Great Britain. The one guiding policy when such issues arise is to keep faith with the native states at any sacrifice.”

14. In a memorandum, which I do not suppose was placed before the present or the past Viceroy, but which I had occasion to write exactly six years ago, in connection with three disputed cases of ceremonials and courtesies, which, after having been actually observed for some years during my minority, were subsequently discontinued in the same period, but which, it cannot be too gratefully added, were *all* decided in favour of my State by His Excellency Lord Hardinge, it was pointed out that, in view of the great value and importance which is naturally attached in our States to all questions of ceremonials and to the *izzat* and dignity of the Ruling Princes and Chiefs, one of the highest ambitions of a Ruler was to hand down unimpaired to his son or successor such honours and privileges as he was entitled to receive ; that any

curtailment thereof was looked upon as a disgrace to the Ruler, his House, and his State; that if anyone through indifference or other reasons rendered their curtailment possible, his family and subjects looked upon him as having brought discredit to his State and to have cast a slur upon the good name and fame of his Ancestors and his House, and as having lost that which it had cost them so much to win; and that as our relatives and nobles, our ministers and officials, and indeed all classes of our subjects, watch with eager interest and attention the most minute and exact details of each and every form of such courtesies and ceremonials, a Ruler rises and falls in their estimation, and his prestige is enhanced or lowered, in accordance with the degree of courtesies and honours enjoyed by him. It was added that whilst the loyal and the greater majority of his subjects rejoice at or resent the strict observance or curtailment of his *izzat* and privileges which they look upon as their own, and which are rightly regarded as our most sacred and priceless heritage, any adverse change, apart from weakening our prestige in the eyes of our discontented and disloyal subjects— who even though a small minority are unfortunately to be found in many of our States— creates fresh difficulties, rendering our task of administration more arduous. It may here be stated in passing that the pleasure or resentment at the maintenance or curtailment of the *izzat* and privileges of Rulers of States is, contrary to views held in certain official circles, also shared outside our States by saner British India. I am acquainted with several loyal and prominent public men of various parts of the Indian Empire who have often regretfully commented on the difference in the present position of the Rulers. And the same can be said to apply to former times. For, from an article entitled “Protected Princes in India,” by the late Sir David Wedderburn, Bart, in *The Nineteenth Century* of July 1878, it will be found that “shortly before Lord Lytton’s imperial assemblage took place, a very remarkable document was prepared by the Poona Sarvajanik Sabha” (National Association), “an influential native association. It was known as the Deccan Address to her Majesty, and bore originally the date of 5th December, 1876, being intended as a reply to the gracious proclamation to be issued on the approaching New Year’s day. It was, in fact, a petition praying her Majesty to inaugurate a number of important reforms upon . . . her assuming the new title of Empress of India”, in which the following passages occur :—

“ . . . it was apprehended at one time that the treaty rights and independence of the princes and chiefs of the country would be to some extent overridden by claims founded upon the assumption of the Imperial title. On this point your most gracious Majesty’s Ministers have vouchsafed an assurance that beyond legalising *de jure* what has been true in fact—namely, that the British power is paramount over all other powers in India, which are protected by its sovereign rule, the treaty rights and independence of native princes will be respected as before. . . . By the assumption of the Imperial title your most gracious Majesty has formally assumed larger responsibilities than before in connection with the Government of India. Your subjects earnestly hope that on this memorable occasion your most gracious Majesty will feel disposed to show generous sympathy with some of the native chiefs, . . . It is their humble prayer that the same magnanimous consideration and firm adherence to treaty obligations which were shown in the restoration of the states of Dhar and Mysore, will influence the councils of your Majesty in disposing finally of the yet pending questions . . . Such acts of royal condescension and sympathy with fallen greatness will not fail to reflect additional lustre on the Government, and

will set at rest the anxieties of the Princes and people of this country on the score of the revival of the annexation policy."

As Sir David Wedderburn remarked, "The Poona Sarvajanik Sabha may be regarded as representing enlightened native opinion in a part of India where the enlightenment is greater than usual, and where a certain amount of public spirit exists."

15. To this might at the present moment be added that besides generally impairing our authority, any lowering of our prestige – however unintentional and from whatever causes – has other far-reaching effects, and also at times renders difficult our official dealings with the British officers, whether lent to our States or directly in our service, and it is even reflected in the Anglo-Indian Press.

16. In my letter dated the 29th December, 1909, in answer to Lord Minto's *Kharita* regarding measures for the suppression of sedition, I had ventured to state that no person could render any signal service, or come to wield any beneficial influence of any importance, without prestige and position, which depended on the consideration and support given to him by the State. It was added that, as in the past so in the future also, in all times of storm and stress the Ruling Princes and Chiefs were destined to play a prominent and honourable part in the history of the British Empire in India, that their loyalty, which had stood the severe test of time and specially of the Mutiny, was genuine, and that should the time come again, it was confidently asserted that we could be depended upon, when we would give further proofs by deeds and not by words alone. It was pointed out that in ordinary times of peace, and specially when sedition was on the rise, there appeared to be a great demand for influential and responsible persons to come forward and do something more than mere talk to support, and co-operate with, the Government by denouncing sedition and disloyal movements, disillusioning the ignorant and the weak by exposing the real character and motives of the seditionists and thus rendering some substantial service.

17. It was however pointed out that for diverse reasons our dignity and importance had gradually diminished to some extent, that we did not occupy the same position as we did some 40 or 50 years ago, and that this fact consequently detracted from our usefulness in British India as well, and lessened our influence and power of doing good and of contributing our modest quota to help the British Government outside our States also. In offering the above remarks I had in view the position occupied by the Ruling Princes and Chiefs at the outbreak of the Mutiny, and the great and wholesome influence on the side of Government which they had brought to bear upon the masses in India at the time. And in that letter also a strong plea was urged for restoring their *izzat* and dignity to its former standard.

18. I then also ventured to invite attention to another factor which may be said still to exist – and it is that the conditions existing at present place in the hands of the seditionists and evil-wishers of the British Government a powerful weapon for making mischief. For they always harp upon such matters and try to make capital out of them by stating that the recent sympathetic policy of Government towards the States was only superficial and dictated solely by the unrest in India, that as soon as matters improved the States would be again relegated to the background, and that nothing but a general agitation and thorough discontent amongst the Ruling Princes and Chiefs would lead to any results in the way of getting matters put right, &c., &c. Although, as then stated, the good sense

of the Rulers of States can no doubt be depended upon on such occasions, considerable mischief and harm is apt at times to be done by such persons playing upon the feelings of our subjects, alienating the latter's sympathies, and creating an atmosphere of mistrust and suspicion against the Paramount Power.

19. The position of the Ruling Princes and Chiefs in regard to such matters is a very delicate one. Their sense of loyalty to the Government of India and their natural reluctance 'to blow their own trumpets' do not render it easy for them to broach the subject. On the other hand it is unquestionable that there is a considerable amount of anxiety and general feeling amongst their ranks in respect of such questions concerning their *izzat* and privileges, though this feeling may not be freely voiced by all through nervousness or other such reasons. Within the last four years there has been, to my knowledge, even talk of a formal representation being made touching the diminution of our dignity and privileges, and I have with my own eyes seen Princes, whose loyalty to the Emperor is beyond dispute, deeply affected, and even in tears, when speaking on the subject. As nothing in the nature of agitation on the part of such a community as ours was considered either becoming or advisable, some of us suggested that in the first instance informal representation and personal discussions would be preferable. And it is gratifying to see that these counsels prevailed. If nothing is said to get matters put right, we stand in danger of losing our rights and privileges. Now with daily growing social intercourse the question has become acute. In this intensely practical age the process of levelling has gone on all round. All fine distinctions tend to become obliterated and greater contact has bred unceremoniousness. In all official intercourse the greatest attention to the minutest details of ceremonial procedure is rightly paid both by Government and our States. Whilst, therefore, we on our part are particular to pay in the strictest form the courtesies and honours due to others, we not unnaturally expect the same in return. Speaking for my State, when the disputed cases of ceremonials, referred to above, arose, it was gratifying to note that not a single instance could be quoted in which we had departed from past practice in such matters, and I expect the same will be found to apply to most, if not all, other States. But punctiliousness on our part as to forms is held by some to be synonymous with narrowness and 'bad form', and the claiming of any such rights has even been termed as 'truculent', by Mr. Lovat Fraser !

20. The official standpoint from which the position of the States and their Rulers has been viewed of late, has, it is submitted, not always been historical or one in accordance with actual past practice and usage and treaty engagements. Whilst some of the existing conditions may be the outcome of incorrect notions of Imperialism entertained by certain officials, true Imperialism as a matter of fact has no greater advocates than the Ruling Princes themselves, who are proud of their position in the great British Empire, and who will do *anything* for their Gracious Emperor. Our view of the matter, however, is that this question has not consistently been treated from the standpoint of true Imperialism which would seem to demand the most liberal and generous treatment of the Ruling Princes and Chiefs, so that with a place again accorded to them in India consistent with history and tradition, the term Empire would acquire a real significance which, it is respectfully submitted, it cannot otherwise be said fully to possess now in India. To an outsider, it would almost appear as if such official view had lost sight of a fact which I may be permitted to state here with all modesty, namely, that it is only His Imperial Majesty the King of England and

Emperor of India Who, alone of all other Sovereigns in the whole World, has under Him such great Princes of ancient and noble lines; and that the higher the position and honour assigned to them, the greater the lustre and glory of the Empire. Already in the British Empire, there is a King of Uganda, and recently Egypt, with its newly created Sultan, has come under His Imperial Majesty's protection, without Imperial prestige and interests being jeopardised in any way. The degree of consideration and honour paid to other potentates in other parts of the British Empire appears from all accounts to be marked. Formerly the Ruling Princes and Chiefs of India also enjoyed similar honour in India - which they still have the privilege of enjoying in England, the heart of the Empire - without any prejudicial effects to the Empire. It cannot be contended by our worst enemies that the Indian Princes and Chiefs of former times were more loyal than we of the present generation are, and that we are thus not deserving of the honours, usage, and terms irrefutably applied by the officers of Government themselves to our forefathers, or that such honours and usage in the past resulted in our Ancestors turning disloyal after the Mutiny.

21. After all, it is believed that the Government of India have themselves not refused to treat the States as autonomous on the whole; the resulting independence - to whatever degree - of their position is undisputed and has been guarded by specific provisions of Law; the courts in England, too, disclaim jurisdiction over 'the Sovereign Princes of India', and the Treaties and other Engagements with the States are, as already stated, unmistakable in their tenor; all of which facts point to the irresistible conclusion that in wanting their legitimate position and prestige to be restored and placed on an assured footing, and maintained intact, they cannot be said to be exceeding their limits or asking for what is not due to them by right.

22. In this connection the following extract will, it is hoped, not be found inappropriate, from the despatch, dated the 30th April, 1860, from Lord Canning to the Secretary of State for India "upon the subject of Adoptions, as affecting succession in the Native States and Principalities of India," published by order of the Governor-General in the Gazette, dated the 15th December, 1860:—

"The safety of our rule is increased, not diminished, by the maintenance of Native Chiefs well-affected to us. "In the" Mutiny "these patches of Native government served as breakwaters to the storm which would otherwise have swept over us in one great wave. And in quiet times they have their uses; And should the day come when India shall be threatened by an external enemy, or when the interests of England elsewhere may require that her Eastern Empire shall incur more than ordinary risk, one of our best mainstays will be found in these Native States. But to make them so, we must treat their Chiefs with consideration and generosity, teaching them that in spite of all suspicions to the contrary their independence is safe, It was long ago said by Sir John Malcolm, that if we made all India into Zillahs it was not in the nature of things that our Empire should last fifty years; but that if we could keep up a number of Native States, as royal instruments, we should exist in India as long as our Naval superiority in Europe was maintained."

23. Matters would appear now to have come to a pass when the Ruling Princes and Chiefs stand in need of all the help and support which His Excellency

the Viceroy may be pleased to give. The Princes and Chiefs have invariably deserved well of the Government. Their solid loyalty and devotion to their Emperor during the present War also speaks for itself. By restoring them to their former high place in the Empire, compatible with their position as Allies acting in subordinate co-operation with the British Government, with their ancient lineage, traditions, and history, and with the fact that Native India rules over at least one-third of this great Country and over one-fourth of its entire population, no Imperial principles will be violated or adversely affected; and the graceful conceding and generous recognition of their not unjust claims, at this opportune moment, will remove disabilities which to them have been extremely discouraging and disheartening, and under which they are indisputably labouring at the present moment. From the Imperial as well as from every other standpoint some steps appear to be of imperative and urgent necessity, and I feel that it can be safely asserted that there is a universal hope and expectation that His Excellency Lord Hardinge, during his extended term of Viceroyalty, will be pleased to get something effective done, which will make the Ruling Princes and Chiefs as happy and contented as they are loyal to their Emperor.

24. These general remarks may be fitly concluded with the following further quotations from Sir William Lee-Warner's book, which, it is hoped, will not be found irrelevant :—

“ Definition of Native state. A Native state is a political community, occupying a territory in India of defined boundaries, and subject to a common and responsible ruler who has actually enjoyed and exercised, as belonging to him in his own right duly recognised by the supreme authority of the British Government, any of the functions and attributes of internal sovereignty. ... The rights, which form part of the aggregate, are specifically named by the publicists, who distinguish them as the right to make war or peace, the right to administer civil and criminal justice, the right to legislate, and so forth. A sovereign who possesses the whole of these rights is called an independent sovereign, but there is not, nor has there ever been, in International laws anything to prevent some of these rights being lodged with one possessor and some with another. Sovereignty has always been regarded as divisible. ... No Native state in the interior of India enjoys the full attributes of complete external and internal sovereignty, since to none is left either the power of declaring war or peace, or the right of negotiating agreements with other states; but the sovereignty of Native states is shared between the British Government and the Chiefs in varying degrees. ... ”

“ No authoritative rules of treatment. Not the least of the victories of peace achieved by the East India Company was its transfer to the Crown of Great Britain and Ireland of the honourable duty of maintaining and improving the network of alliances, which it had already established with nearly seven hundred states, of various degrees of importance, in the interior of the country. The political “union and friendship,” to borrow a phrase from the Company's treaty with the Nizam in 1800, established with the Indian sovereigns had already taught native society that the British rulers, unlike any of their predecessors, desired as much to respect the rights of others as to maintain their own. ”

“ The permanency of the union. But they will at least serve to illustrate the complex and difficult nature of the task which the British Government has undertaken in India, namely of preserving to its allies their

semi-sovereign powers, and yet leading them to use their authority for the good of their principalities and for the common welfare of the whole Empire into which they have been admitted. If it is creditable to the Company and the Crown that the nineteenth century closed with the survival of so many states; it is also no small honour to the native chiefs that from such a beginning and with so many drawbacks they have rendered an alliance possible. ... ”

“The importance of maintaining past policy. ... Violence must be done to history, diplomatic engagements, legislative enactments, legal decisions, and long-established usage, if we are to discard ideas of suzerainty or sovereignty as inapplicable to the Native states of India, and incompatible with the future development of the Indian Empire. In the King-Emperor’s dealings with Foreign states there is no concealment of the fact that the rulers of Native states possess a large measure of internal sovereignty. Commercial and extradition treaties with Foreign Powers reserve such rights, and when their provisions are made applicable to the Native states, the following words are used: “including the territories of any Native prince or chief in India under the suzerainty of the British Government.” When, again, arrangements are made with an Indian prince for jurisdiction over railways or tracts of country the language used is unequivocal. Thus the language of Indian treaties as well as that of British treaties with European powers boldly affirms the sovereign rights of the Native states.”

“The voice of British Legislatures and British judges is equally clear. Parliament in the Interpretation Act, 1889, §18. (5) defines India “as British India together with territories of any Native prince or chief under the suzerainty of Her Majesty, exercised through the Governor-General of India or other officer subordinate to the Governor-General of India.” Several Acts passed by the Indian Legislature apply to subjects of His Majesty “within the dominions of princes and states in India in alliance with Her Majesty,” The imperial Courts of Appeal give no countenance to the theory that no “sovereignty” is left to the Native states. And most significant was the Report of the Privy Council in 1902 in the Matabeleland case. “The situation is one very familiar to Indian lawyers and administrators. For in India there are hundreds of states in which the East India Company during its rule, and afterwards the Crown, has acquired large powers of administration. And yet, unless there has been cession of territory, the least independent of such states is for some important purposes a foreign state, its subjects are not British subjects, the laws passed by the Indian Legislature do not affect them, and it is subject to such rules as have been duly made in accordance with the jurisdiction acquired over it.” ”

“How far continuous usage has affirmed the possession of attributes of semi-sovereignty by the Native states must be gathered from the pages of this book, and the discussion may be concluded with a plea for adherence to a policy which has preserved the integrity and secured the loyal co-operation of nearly seven hundred princes and chiefs. Any removal of a check against encroachment and interference could not fail to excite the resentment and alarms of the King’s allies. A habit of mind or language, which should encourage the belief that the Native rulers are merely delegates and agents of the British Government, and not entitled in their own right to exercise authority over their subjects within the limitations which have been

described, would not only retard progress, but excite opposition to reform. Sound policy no less than good faith is on the side of the legal authorities who treat the Native princes as possessed of varying degrees of internal sovereignty dependent upon the British Government. It cannot be denied that the shelter of International conceptions and rules protects a weak state from dangers to which a constitutional tie would expose it. In daily intercourse with the neighbouring states which occupy so large a space in India, the British administration must constantly ask for co-operation, sometimes even for the cession of rights. Human nature everywhere is more prone to grant what is asked for as a reasonable favour than demanded as a right. The responsibilities of the British rulers of India are large enough without making unnecessary demands on the hereditary rulers of Native states. Since public opinion is apt to be impatient in its demand for reforms, it is expedient that it should realise the solemn promises embodied in Lord Canning's Sanads and in Queen Victoria's gracious proclamation, and the restrictions imposed upon it by the public acts of the British Nation. It is only by such means that the good faith of Great Britain can be maintained, and the vision realised, which Tennyson beautifully expressed in "Akbar's Dream" :-

Me too the black-wing'd Azrael overcame,
But Death had ears and eyes ; I watch'd my son,
And those that follow'd, loosen, stone from stone,
All my fair work ; and from the ruin arose
The shriek and curse of trampled millions, even
As in the time before ; but while I groan'd,
From out the sunset pour'd an alien race,
Who fitted stone to stone again, and Truth,
Peace, Love and Justice came and dwelt therein."

25. Before proceeding to deal specifically with the points which I am taking the liberty of putting forward, for reasons detailed in paras 1 to 5, I would venture to suggest that one or more committees, as may appear desirable, should be convened in December or January consisting of Ruling Princes, or Ruling Princes and Chiefs, to deal with such points as are suitable to be referred to a committee. The business sittings of such committee or committees should be presided over by a Member of His Excellency's Executive Council who may be in real sympathy with the States and their Rulers ; and amongst other Government officers sitting on such committees should also be the Secretary for the Political Department. In my humble opinion the convening, also at an early date of a conference too, apart from committees, is absolutely necessary for the consideration, in all their various aspects, and settlement of such points as directly concern only the Government of India in the Political Department and the Rulers, their States, and their people. Whilst giving universal satisfaction, and being the only way of arriving at satisfactory conclusions, a conference will also give the Rulers of States an opportunity of frankly putting their difficulties before Government in this informal manner which cannot but be productive of the greatest good. It is however essential that the Princes and Chiefs invited to sit on such committees and conference should be fully representative of their Order whose selection would inspire general confidence. The conference need only be of an informal nature, its proceedings and deliberations being strictly confidential and not communicated to the Press ; and any other necessary safeguards may be imposed. If His Excellency the Viceroy could spare the time to open the conference or to visit it again at any special time, the honour would be much appreciated and it would be all the more encouraging. Given the fullest

and freest discussion in a friendly manner, and provided, as we are confident, the official attitude is one of sympathy, nothing will be of such help in solving any difficult problems and giving a general feeling of assurance to all concerned as a round table conference.

Precedence.

26. I may be laughed at by some as a 'pessimist'—and even accused of exaggeration—but, judging from my own knowledge of the feeling existing on the subject, and looking well ahead, I can conscientiously give serious expression to my profound belief that since the time when Lord Dalhousie's cruel policy of annexation was happily substituted by the present sagacious and just policy—inaugurated by that great Viceroy, Lord Canning—there are no questions in connection with the Indian States and their Rulers more deserving of greater and urgent attention, or favourable and generous consideration, on the part of the Government of India than those affecting the *izzat* and dignity, or the privileges, of the Ruling Princes. Amongst the former that of their precedence stands first and foremost.

27. In case it is alleged in any quarter that this question has become acute only since the appointment of an Indian gentleman to the Governor-General's Executive Council, it seems desirable to state clearly that such an assertion would be misjudging the Indian character. It may be taken for granted that the majority of Indians of all ranks are extremely gratified at this happy and necessary reform, and the Ruling Princes and Chiefs have already unmistakably shown their delight in honouring, and extending all due courtesy to, those of their brother Indians whom the Sovereign has been pleased to honour by elevating to high office.

28. Amongst the Indian Princes and in their States, it is not uncommonly believed that the present situation is the result of the special endeavours of some permanent officials in India, and that it is only in the last decade or so that the Ruling Princes of India—"my great Princes," as His Imperial Majesty was gracious enough to allude to them in His speech at the Imperial Durbar at Delhi in 1911—by this comparatively recent arrangement, have been held to rank and to take precedence after the Ordinary Members of the Executive Council of the Governor-General.

29. Not only does this arrangement affect the Ruling Princes injuriously inasmuch as it has been instrumental in lowering their *izzat*, dignity, and position, but, it may be submitted with all respect and deference, it is generally held to be also anomalous and arbitrary.

30. It is difficult for any one with an intimate knowledge of the ways of the Indian States and the past generations of their Rulers, and of the very great importance attached to all such questions, to conceive that had such a question arisen even 30 or 40 years ago, it would not have evoked an immediate representation to the Government of India as well as a respectful memorial presented to Her late Imperial Majesty the Queen-Empress.

31. Hence the universal belief that this arrangement is one of comparatively recent date. Beyond this we are not in a position to know as to exactly when this arrangement came into force, since none of the Ruling Princes were apparently addressed about, or informed of, this arrangement whenever it was given effect to. There, moreover, exists an irrefutable precedent which, it is submitted, proves that the Members of Council did *not* take precedence of the

Ruling Princes upto as lately as 1885 at any rate, for it is clear that in the Durbar held by Lord Dufferin at Rawalpindi on the 8th April of that year for the reception of the late Amir of Afghanistan, the Maharajah of Patiala—a 17 gun Prince—distinctly sat *above all* the Ordinary Members of the Governor-General's Council, and that below him the Members of Council and the then Commanders-in-Chief of Bombay and Madras *only* occupied *alternate seats* with the remaining Ruling Princes of the Punjab.

32. It is significant that although the Members of Council are entitled to a salute of 15 guns, they only occupied alternate seats with Ruling Princes entitled to salutes of even 11 guns (such as, of Jind, Nabha, Kapurthala, Faridkote, and Chamba). This, together with the important fact that, to begin with, a Ruling Prince—the Maharajah of Patiala—sat above *all* Members of Council and the two Commanders-in-Chief, strongly establishes the claim of the Ruling Princes that they did not in the past, and should not now have to, take precedence after such “high officials.” If more exhaustive search and enquiries are instituted, specially in regard to older periods, there appears little room for doubt that further instances of this kind will be found, even more favourable to the Ruling Princes.

33. The underlying principle of the altered arrangement, so far as we have been able to gather from unofficial discussions and explanations, appears to be that as the Members of Council are the *colleagues* of His Excellency the Viceroy, and together with the Governor-General constitute the Government of India, which is supreme, there is nothing incongruous in the Members of Council, as component parts of Government, taking precedence over the Rulers of Indian States.

34. On a further examination of the question in this light, there appear however to be certain anomalies which are not easy of explanation. If merely on the ground of their having “acknowledged the supremacy” of, and of their engaging to “act in subordinate co-operation” with, the British Government, the Ruling Princes, who none the less have the very high honour and proud privilege—according to the indisputable terms of their Treaties and actual usage and practice unequivocally accepted in the past by the Government themselves—of being “perpetual” *friends* and *allies*, are given precedence after Members of the Executive Council, then, it is submitted, it does appear ‘incongruous’ that Lieutenant-Governors of Provinces (not to speak of Governors of Presidencies) nevertheless do take precedence of the Members of Council.

35. At the risk of digression it appears necessary, before proceeding any further, to quote below what Sir William Lee-Warner writes as to the reasons leading to such subordinate co-operation:—

“From this ... it is convenient to pass to the examination of British treaties with the King's allies. ... The treaties, grants, and engagements of the Indian chiefs must therefore be studied together as a whole. ... In the next period, which lasted from 1814 to the Mutiny of 1857, larger schemes of empire dawned upon its horizon and dominated the policy of its Governor-Generals. The exclusion of any states from the protectorate was proved by experience to be both impolitic and cowardly. Empire was forced upon the British rulers of India, and the bitter fruits of a policy of leaving the states unprotected were gathered in the Pindari war, in the revival of schemes of conquests in the minds of the Maratha chiefs, and in the humiliation of the Rajput Houses. Surrounded on all sides by the

country princes, the Company's officers saw that no alternative remained except annexation, which they wished to avoid, or a thorough political settlement of the empire step by step with the extension of their direct rule. Without order on their frontier, peace in their own territories was impossible; and the only prospect of order amongst the Native states was to undertake arbitration in all their disputes with each other and to deprive all alike of the right to make war, or to enter into any unauthorised conventions with each other. The policy adopted in this period was one of isolating the Native states and subordinating them to the political ascendancy of the British Power. The expressions of "mutual alliance" and "reciprocal agreement" were exchanged for the phrases "subordinate alliance," "protection," and "subordinate co-operation." But whilst the states were deprived of all control over their external relations, the traditional policy of non-interference was still for a while preserved in their internal affairs. There the phrases of international law maintained their last stronghold, and it was deemed inconsistent with a sovereignty to introduce a foreign agency for effecting any reforms. No remedy for continued misrule was then known except a declaration of war, or, at a later date, annexation. ..."

"Then the Mutiny occurred, and after its suppression a final change took place in the relations of the Native states with the paramount power. As Lord Canning expressed it, "the Crown of England stands forth the unquestioned ruler in all India." From that date prevention was regarded as better than punishment; guidance and correction preferable to war or annexation. ... The main object in view was to preserve the Native principalities from annexation; and if the intervention of the British authorities was needed to save a protected principality from ruin, then it was better to abandon the principle of non-interference so dear to International lawyers, and so avoid more serious alterations in the map of India. These views prevailed and the thoughts of statesmen turned from subordinate alliances to the best means of promoting a solid union between the territories of the Empire governed by the British and the states protected by His Majesty. ..."

The Ruling Princes in this connection may therefore urge with right on their side that the very fact that subordinate co-operation was rendered necessary, not only in the interests of the Empire of which they form an integral part, but in their own interests as well, *i.e.*, for the very preservation of their Principalities, should not go against them in the question of honours and precedence; and all the more so after the lapse of a very considerable period.

36. Although it was only fair to quote the full matter bearing on the subject, it is equally necessary to point out that Sir William Lee-Warner has apparently made a slight mistake in matters of detail. It was between the very period mentioned, *i.e.*, 1814 to 1857, that Treaties with Bikaner (1818) and several other States were concluded but far from the expressions of "mutual alliance" and "reciprocal agreement" having been exchanged during this period for the phrase "subordinate alliance," the Bikaner and other Treaties contain distinct clauses such as, "perpetual friendship, alliance, and unity of interests" and "the friends and enemies of one party shall be the friends and enemies of both parties." And it is *after* the latter clause that clauses are to be found where "the British Government engages to protect the principality and territory of Bikaner" and where my Ancestor and his heirs and successors engaged to "act in subordinate co-operation with the British Government and acknowledge its supremacy." Nor indeed can it be said that since the Mutiny

occurred any further or final change took place in the relations of the Native States with the Paramount Power, for at the Imperial Assemblage of 1877 Lord Lytton in his speech on that memorable occasion referred to the Ruling Princes in the beginning as "Her Majesty's great allies" and the same day later on when addressing the "Princes and Chiefs of this Empire" he spoke of them as "feudatories and allies" of the British Crown. In ordinary official correspondence also subsequent to the Mutiny the term 'Allies' is to be met with – it has actually been used after that period in the case of Bikaner, *vide* first extract in para 64 – and as already shown, Her late Imperial Majesty Queen Victoria in Her Proclamation was pleased to announce that all Treaties and Engagements made by the East India Company "are by Us accepted, and will be scrupulously maintained," whilst the extracts from Sir William Lee-Warner's book, quoted on page 5, show that he himself wrote that "these solemn documents ... have acquired the most formal recognition of Parliament" which had "enacted that all treaties made by the said Company shall be binding on Her Majesty," and moreover, in his book, he has himself frequently also used the terms "King's Allies," "Allies," "alliance," &c., as applying to present day conditions.

37. But to return to the subject, a Lieutenant-Governor – however high an officer he may be and even as the ruler for the time being of a British Province – is absolutely subordinate to, and entirely under the orders of, the Government of India: what is more, he is clearly a servant of the Crown. On the other hand, the relations of the Ruling Princes of India with the British Government, though of subordinate co-operation, are yet of "*perpetual friendship and alliance*" and as such ought certainly to entitle them to rank above the ordinary servants of the Crown. Besides, it may be respectfully added, they are Rulers in a higher and more effective sense, the hereditary and "absolute Rulers of their countries" (*Atchison's Treaties*) and – subject to the suzerainty of His Imperial Majesty – indisputably enjoying and exercising several "functions and attributes of internal sovereignty" and a large measure of independence, which has been actually recognized in the past by His Government out here: which is all the more reason why the Ruling Princes, too, should take precedence of the Members of Council.

38. But the Lieutenant-Governors of Provinces are not the only "high officials" who, according to the Warrant of Precedence in India, rank above the Ordinary Members of Council. There are also the Chief Justice of Bengal and the Metropolitan of India (Bishop of Calcutta). Thus they must also *ipso facto* take precedence of the Ruling Princes. There would, it is urged, appear to be still less reason why the Ruling Princes should be made to take precedence after the Chief Justice and the Metropolitan, and yet this is the corollary of the arrangement under discussion.

39. Another interesting point in logic arises out of the relative precedence of the Chief Justice or the Metropolitan and the Members. Neither of these dignitaries is either the ruler of a Province or a part composing the Government of India. It has been noticed that the Royal Warrant of Precedence, issued in 1876, was substituted by the Warrant at present in force bearing date the 10th of December, 1898. In laying down this relative precedence it was presumably held that although *collectively* the Governor-General and the Members of his Council are the Government of India, yet *individually* the Members are neither the Government of India nor by any means the direct – or

indirect—representatives of His Imperial Majesty the King-Emperor. It is this very claim of *individual* Members of Council to a position which can only be said to belong to the collective body constituting the Government of India, that is questioned, and the distinction, made in the case of the Chief Justice and the Bishop of Calcutta, may, it is urged, be borne in mind in contrasting the respective claims to relative precedence of the Ruler of a State allied to the British Government and a Member of Council.

40. Then again, to examine the principle upon which the present precedence of Members is presumably based, the office of the Governor-General in Council was, so far as can be gathered, constituted by Statute 3 and 4 Will. IV. cap. 85 passed in 1833. It appears to be sufficiently clear from the preceding paragraphs that this principle was not held to apply in the case of the Chief Justice of Bengal and the Metropolitan upto seventeen years ago, in which case, it can be safely contended, it cannot *ipso facto* have been intended to apply to the Ruling Princes either. But even if the principle arises out of that statute, for any high official to claim its enforcement after the lapse of at least 82 years is again a case entirely in favour of the Ruling Princes, and even if such a claim was technically indisputable on other grounds also, to quote again from Sir William Lee-Warner, "A demand, just in itself, may produce injustice, if enforced at a particular crisis, and "right too rigid hardens into wrong"."

41. Apart from the points mentioned in the preceding paragraphs, there is yet another significant point which would appear to show the inconsistency of the arrangement, and of the above mentioned underlying principle, as also in itself to establish the claims of the Ruling Princes to precedence over the Ordinary Members of Council and other high officials. The statement in paragraph 28 stands in need of certain qualification. It should have been stated that every one of the Ruling Princes of India, *with the exception of the Rulers of Hyderabad, Baroda, and Mysore*, has, under this official arrangement, to take precedence after the Members of Council.

42. Whilst we rejoice at the recognition of the claims of even three of our brother Princes to precedence, it is sincerely to be hoped that no motives of jealousy will be assigned when it is stated that their only distinguishing feature in juxtaposition with the rest of the Ruling Princes of India seems to be that they enjoy a permanent salute of 21 guns. But this difference does not anyhow affect the principle upon which the precedence of the Members would appear to have been determined.

43. In the past and even upto the Imperial Durbar of 1911, these three Ruling Princes shared equally the various courtesies and honours with a large number of their brother Princes. For instance, when His Imperial Majesty was graciously pleased to receive His Ruling Princes at Delhi in 1911, no difference whatever was made in the form of the ceremonials observed and the courtesies extended to them. On this occasion not only the Rulers of Hyderabad, Baroda, and Mysore but also all other Rulers enjoying salutes of upto 15 guns—and although the programme as regards the 13, 11, and 9 gun Princes and Chiefs was altered to the extent that instead of being received collectively they too were graciously received separately—as well as those enjoying lower salutes were on alighting from their carriages all met by the same officials, conducted similarly to the Audience Chamber, met on entering the Audience Chamber by the Master of the Ceremonies, His Imperial Majesty was pleased to extend the same honour to all, the ceremony of presenting *itr* and *pan* was the same in all cases, and

the ceremonies on their departure were identical in all cases with those observed on their arrival. The only difference was the customary one in regard to the escorts, which again were the same for all Princes enjoying 21, 19 and 17 gun salutes, *viz.*, 2 Non-commissioned Officers and 12 Sowars—all the other Princes being furnished with an escort of 1 Non-commissioned Officer and 8 Sowars. In the Army Regulations, India, it is also clearly laid down that the 21 and 19 gun Princes are furnished with a Guard of Honour 100 strong with a Subedar, two Jemadars, Band and Regimental Colours; that a Guard of 50 Indian Infantry under an Indian officer is furnished for 17, 15, 13 and 11 gun Princes; escorts when furnished consist of two Non-commissioned Officers and 12 Sowars for 21, 19 and 17 gun Princes; guards at their residences consisting of 2 Non-commissioned Officers and 12 Sepoys are the same for 21, 19, 17 and 15 gun Princes; whilst the escort furnished to attend on a Prince when he goes out is the same, consisting of one Non-commissioned Officer and 3 Sowars from 21 to 11 gun Princes. There is thus no privilege or courtesy which is *exclusively* extended to the 21 gun Princes. It may also be added here that none of us have been aware that in past practice any real discrimination was made with reference to the different groups of Princes enjoying various salutes, although there is, and must necessarily be, juniority and seniority even amongst those enjoying the same salutes. Any invidious distinction, if made in the future, cannot but have unfortunate results, in that it will cause further anxiety and alarm to all Ruling Princes, whilst it must inevitably also lead to controversy and disputes in regard to the various high officials of Government who may claim to take precedence over us on the ground of the number of guns to which they are entitled. It may even lead at some future date to the salutes of such officers being revised and increased, tending to further complications. I have heard a high officer, formerly serving in India, state that whereas the salutes of Ruling Princes and Chiefs are often increased (*sic*) the salutes of Members of Council and other high officials have been stationary (this statement is also open to correction), and to this reason he attributed the dispute about the question of precedence. Once this dangerous and questionable principle comes to be accepted by Government, nothing will be easier in days to come than for a large number of other officers to obtain an increase of salutes and, with that, precedence over His Imperial Majesty's Ruling Princes.

44. Then turning to analyse, what is a more important consideration, the terms of the Treaties and Engagements with the various States, the majority of such documents as a rule contain words and clauses about the following:—

- (1) Perpetual friendship and alliance.
- (2) Unity of interests.
- (3) The friends and enemies of one party shall be the friends and enemies of both parties.
- (4) Subordinate co-operation and the supremacy of the British Government.
- (5) The Ruling Prince, his heirs, and successors to remain absolute rulers of their country and British jurisdiction not to be introduced into the Principality.

(i) With regard to the first point, the Treaty with Hyderabad is of "honour, favour, alliance and friendship," the first two words are additional, but being of mutual application, make no material difference to the point under discussion. The old Treaty with Mysore appears to contain no such clause,

whilst with Baroda the Treaty is of "lasting peace and alliance." In regard to the States of other Ruling Princes, in the case of a very large majority the general term used is "perpetual friendship and alliance."

(ii) The clause about unity of interests appears chiefly in the case of the Rajputana States but does not seem to occur in the case of Hyderabad, Baroda, and Mysore.

(iii) The third point is frequently met with in almost all the States.

(iv) The clause about subordinate co-operation and the supremacy of the British Government exists in the case of many, but not all, Rulers of 19, 17, and lower gun salutes. Although the phraseology of the "Instrument of Transfer, 1881," in regard to Mysore State is of a different nature, far from such provisions being absent, in paragraph 4 is stated, "the Maharajah ... and his successors ... shall at all times remain faithful in allegiance and subordination to Her Majesty the Queen ... Empress of India ... and perform all the duties which in virtue of such allegiance and subordination may be demanded of them." If clauses about subordinate co-operation and the supremacy of the British Government are not so definitely traceable in the case of Hyderabad and Baroda, it cannot, it is submitted, give these two States alone any special rights on this score, as similar phraseology has apparently been altogether omitted in the case of some other States also, and I can cite such an instance in regard to at least one State (in Rajputana) whose Ruler is entitled only to a salute of 15 guns. Other similar cases will probably also be found.

(v) The clause about the Ruling Princes being absolute Rulers of their States and the Government engaging not to introduce British jurisdiction into them is particularly marked in the case of the Rajputana States, but does not appear to find any specific place in the case of Hyderabad and Baroda and still less in that of Mysore.

45. Anyhow, it is imagined that it is not contended by any one that, what is the crux of the whole question, these three Princes owe allegiance to the King-Emperor in a form different to that of the other Princes, or that the political relationship of these 21 gun Princes and their States with the Supreme Government is different to what it is in the case of other Princes and States, particularly, say, of Rajputana and Central India. In fact, if anything, the former and some of the latter have, in contrast with those similarly grouped as 'dependent' States, been actually designated by Government in official documents " 'independent' as having maintained their existence under successive paramount dynasties, and having suffered comparatively little interference in their internal affairs from any." (Despatch from Lord Canning to the Secretary of State for India, dated 30th April, 1860). Moreover, speaking generally, the 21 gun Princes alone have by no means the exclusive monopoly of such terms as 'Sovereign', 'Sovereign Princes of India', 'Hindu Sovereign Princes', 'Full' and 'perpetual Sovereignty', 'Sovereignty', 'Sovereign Rights', 'Allies', 'Independence', 'Independent or Semi-Independent power, possession, or authority,' 'Princes,' 'Consorts', 'Princesses', 'Reigning Chief', 'Reigning Family', 'Reign', 'Throne', 'Dynasty', 'Court', 'Principalities', 'Dominions', 'Government', and 'one of the foremost of the Indian Princes'; which have been freely applied to other Ruling Princes as well, not only in Treaties, Engagements, and Proclamations and speeches of former Viceroys, but also in ordinary official correspondence—some of these terms being used in regard to Princes enjoying salutes of even 11 guns. Thus neither on the ground of their Treaties and Engagements nor in virtue of any special political status or position, and

courtesies and honours exclusively extended to them, can a case be made out to justify any differential treatment being accorded to these three Rulers, and it is once more repeated with the greatest respect that the Rulers of other States are equally justly entitled to what has already been fittingly conceded to the Rulers of Hyderabad, Baroda, and Mysore as their right. With the traditional British sense of justice, it is felt that the fact has only to be represented properly to Government for this wrong to be redressed.

46. After having attempted to deal with facts as they are at present, perhaps a little examination of the probable consequences and future results of the present arrangement will, it is hoped, not be inexcusable.

47. If it is correct for the Ordinary Members of the Governor-General's Council, as forming part of the Government of India, to take precedence of the Ruling Princes, it will also be difficult to deny the rights of the Cabinet Ministers, as forming part of His Imperial Majesty's Government in England, to take precedence over the Princes. Past usage and precedent would however appear to militate against such an inference. The precedence accorded to the Indian Princes at the Court of St. James's at the present day is believed to be immediately after the Ambassadors, which means that we take precedence over all Cabinet Ministers including the Prime Minister himself. Though, alas ! I never had the honour of paying my homage in person to Her late Imperial Majesty Queen Victoria, of Blessed Memory, it is generally understood that Ambassadors were accorded rank in priority to the Ruling Princes only after the lamentable demise of our first Queen-Empress, during Whose reign all Indian Princes are believed to have invariably taken precedence over even the Ambassadors. Considered in the light of the precedent of the present day as well as that of Her late Imperial Majesty's Reign, the fact of the Members of Council taking precedence over the Ruling Princes in India is also, it is respectfully submitted, contrary to old usage and custom. Nor, so far as is known, are the Indian Princes accorded precedence after local Executive Councillors, or such other "high officials", in any other part of the British Empire. For instance, after the war in China in 1900, when His Highness the Maharajah Scindia of Gwalior and I were passing through Hongkong on our way back from the Front, we were both invariably accorded precedence, unasked, immediately after the Governor of Hongkong at various public functions. I know also of an Indian Prince and an English gentleman - now an ex-Cabinet Minister - recently coming to India in the same steamer with a Member of the Governor-General's Council. All three lunched at Aden with the General Commanding there, when the Indian Prince was accorded the place of honour. Before entering the motor car, His Highness courteously invited the Member of Council to get in first, but was met with the retort, "No, Maharajah, you get in first ; we are not in India yet."

48. Then again, if the Members of Council take precedence over the Ruling Princes, it follows that the Members of the Governors', and Lieutenant-Governors' Executive Councils, too, will claim similar precedence, at least in their respective Presidencies and Provinces, over Ruling Princes 'having direct political relations with such Local Governments', in which case it is difficult to imagine how even the Ruling Princes 'having direct political relations with the Government of India', and having no concern with such Local Governments, can also avoid having to take precedence after such Local Executive Councillors. When doing homage to His Imperial Majesty at the

Delhi Durbar in 1911, the Ruling Princes in political relations with the Local Governments of Madras, Bombay, and Bengal followed their respective Executive Councillors, amongst the former being at least two 19, and a few 17, in addition to several 15, and lower gun, Princes. In this connection it should be noted that although having only direct political relations with the Punjab Government, the Ruling Princes of the Punjab did not take precedence below the Members of even the Governor-General's Executive Council at the Rawalpindi Durbar, *vide* paras 31 and 32.

49. The claim of such Local Executive Councillors to take precedence over the Ruling Princes is reported to have already been conceded in the Bombay Presidency, in spite, I have been given clearly to understand, of there being established precedents that all such Princes took precedence in that Presidency immediately after His Excellency the Governor upto a comparatively recent date, although the Bombay Executive Council has presumably been in existence since the year 1833. It is therefore not unreasonable to assume that this example will, on this basis, have to be followed in the other Presidencies and Provinces also – if it is not being already followed.

50. Already the Presidencies of Madras, Bombay, and Bengal, and the Province of Behar and Orissa, have their Executive Councils, the Members of which number 12. Thanks to the sympathetic policy of His Imperial Majesty's Government in England and in India, it can only be a matter of time before all the important Provinces will have Executive Councils of their own. Thus logically speaking when the United Provinces, the Punjab, and Burma – not counting the Chief Commissionerships of the Central Provinces and Assam – have their own Executive Councils, there will be at least 21 Local Executive Councillors alone – excluding the Members of the Governor-General's Council and other high officials who are now given rank above such Ordinary Members – and consequently the Ruling Princes will have to move still further down and take precedence after them all.

51. Not only this, but in that case they will also have to take precedence after several other high officials of Government, such as, the Commander-in-Chief of the Naval Forces in the East Indies; all Chief Justices of High Courts other than that of Bengal; and the Bishops of Madras and Bombay, all of whom at the present moment actually take precedence over the Members of the Madras, Bombay, and Bengal Executive Councils; whilst the Lieutenant-Generals Commanding the Northern and Southern Armies and the Chief of the Staff, who take precedence of the Executive Councillors of Behar and Orissa, except when within their own jurisdictions, will also thus rank prior to the Ruling Princes.

52. Further, the Chief Commissioners of the Central Provinces and Assam; the Residents of Hyderabad and Mysore; the Agents to the Governor-General in Rajputana, Central India, and Baluchistan; and the Chief Commissioner of the North-West Frontier Province are grouped in Article 15 together with the Executive Councillors of Behar and Orissa, and according to the Royal Warrant "those included in one number will take precedence *inter se* according to the date of entry into that number," so that any of the above officers who in virtue of this ruling take precedence over any such Executive Councillors will *ipso facto* take precedence also over the Ruling Princes.

53. Then, as Constitutional Government and representative institutions gain a firm footing in the Country, some day, even though it may appear far off, from the Members of the Executive to the Legislative Councils will be but one step and again only a matter of time.

54. Our honour and dignity is not unlikely to be further endangered some day by such other high officials being accorded precedence above the Ruling Princes as have been placed in the Warrant of Precedence from article 16 to 28, and before the names of the various officials grouped in the first, second, and other classes. Our apprehensions may appear somewhat far-fetched but, it is submitted, they are not unfounded. Formerly in the various official notifications, such as that about the appointment of "Councillors of the Empress" under the signature of Lord Lytton himself, and the programme of the Durbar held for the reception of the late Amir at Rawalpindi in 1885, the names of the Ruling Princes were mentioned before those of the high officials of Government—in the latter, the names of all the Punjab Princes being mentioned before those of the Commander-in-Chief in India and Lieutenant-Governors as well as Members of the Executive Council. Although the tendency for, and change in, the new arrangement began to be noticeable at the time of the Delhi Durbar of 1903, no uniform change was then made, for instance, in the official programme for the State Entry 'the Ruling Chiefs' were mentioned before Governors, Lieutenant-Governors, the Commander-in-Chief, and Members of Council. But in the latter-day official programmes, &c., not only are the Ruling Chiefs—at times only 'Chiefs'—put down after Governors, the Commander-in-Chief, Lieutenant-Governors, and "other high officials"—but very often the term Members of Council has been substituted by "other high officials" or "high officials."* When Governors, Lieutenant-Governors, and the Commander-in-Chief had already been specifically mentioned, who, we anxiously asked, were the "high officials" other than the Members of Council, and if only the Members were meant, why, we again asked, were they not mentioned by name as in previous programmes? Similarly, the official programme for the Durbar in 1911 clearly laid down that "the Governor-General, the High Officials, and the Ruling Chiefs will do homage in the following order:—

* * *

(3) The Ruling Chiefs in political relations with the Government of India and the Agents to the Governor-General and Residents in the following territorial order, ... "

Although in the body of the programme the Agents to the Governor-General and Residents are put down after the Ruling Chiefs, a foot-note is to be found stating that "the Agents to the Governor-General and Residents will each precede their Chiefs and remain until the last of these has done Homage." This, it was presumed, was done to enable such political officers to present their respective Ruling Princes, but the actual presentations however appear to have been made by Sir Henry McMahon, and the fact was much noticed that the Residents of Hyderabad and Mysore *followed* the Rulers of those States—apparently the Resident at Baroda did not accompany the Gaekwar—whereas the Resident in Kashmir and the Agents to the Governor-General in Rajputana, Central India, and Baluchistan not only *walked immediately in front of* their respective Princes upto the front of the Thrones, but whilst the Residents of Hyderabad and Mysore were presented *after* the Nizam and the Maharajah of Mysore, the Resident in Kashmir and the three Agents to the Governor-General were apparently also presented

* In this connection vide also para 67 (ii), pages 29, 30, and 31.

before their respective Ruling Princes. *The Historical Record of the Imperial Visit to India, 1911*, states in this connection, "Following the Council came the Ruling Princes in direct relations with the Government of India, and the principal Political Officers, the representatives of the Viceroy in their States, who in most cases preceded the Chiefs of their groups and remained on the platform while the latter did their Homage. They all advanced up the middle of the ceremonial space ... , where they made their obeisance ... " This constituted a departure not only from the official programme but also from past usage and established ceremonial procedure, for on all public occasions such as the arrival of His Excellency the Viceroy in a State, or in State Processions, &c., political officers – including Agents to the Governor-General – invariably stand or ride on the left of the Ruling Princes but do not stand in front of, or precede, them. Even at Delhi on the occasion of the State Entry in 1911, the Agent to the Governor-General in Rajputana drove in the carriage with His Highness the Maharajah of Jaipur who was seated on Sir Elliot Colvin's right-hand side. Consequently it is feared that Residents and political officers 'accredited to our Courts' may also in a few years' time be given precedence over the Ruling Princes – at least of other States if not the States to which they are appointed. Thus, should the further downward movement in the position of the Ruling Princes once commence, there is no knowing where it may ultimately land them.

55. The arguments in favour of the Ruling Princes being from all considerations entitled to rank prior to the Members of Council might if necessary be multiplied *ad infinitum*. For example, in the Royal Military Processions in England, I have seen Indian Princes, even other than those on the Personal Staff of His Imperial Majesty, also ride immediately behind the Princes of the Imperial and Royal Family, whereas the High Officers and Members of the Imperial Suite ride in front of the Sovereign and of the Imperial and Royal Princes.

56. During the Imperial Visit to India in 1911, certain Members of Their Imperial Majesties' Suite, such as, the Lord-in-Waiting and His Imperial Majesty's Private Secretary, were given precedence before Lieutenant-Governors and Members of the Governor-General's Council (*vide* Table specially issued for the Imperial Indian Visit, showing the Order of Precedence of the Members of Their Imperial Majesties' Personal Suite), while those Ruling Princes who had the honour of being on His Imperial Majesty's Personal Staff, were invariably accorded precedence not only over the Lord-in-Waiting and the King-Emperor's Private Secretary, but also above His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief, and at the Imperial Durbar His Highness Maharajah Sir Pratap Singh and I sat immediately above Sir John Hewett who, apart from himself being the permanent Lieutenant-Governor of the United Provinces, was, as President of the Coronation Durbar Committee, assigned precedence in the above Table before Lieutenant-Governors. When His Imperial Majesty was graciously pleased to recognize this in the case of the Indian Princes on his Staff, the claim of the other Princes also gains additional weight.

57. The officials instrumental in having had these changes brought about, with a view doubtless to adding to the prestige of high British officials – and unfortunately undue attention is at times apt to be paid in all parts of the World to 'prestige' at the sacrifice of other things – not only lost sight of, what, with all respect, can only be termed, the unfairness of the new arrangement, but they also could not have looked ahead and thought of the effect which might be produced, should it unhappily become a 'settled fact', on future generations of Ruling Princes – *i.e.*, their utter despondency, discouragement,

and disappointment at seeing their *izzat* and position steadily on the wane; in spite of so many generations of loyal and meritorious services to their Sovereign and the Empire. Official opinion in India however is, we hope, veering round in favour of the Ruling Princes; but one of the difficulties in satisfactorily settling this question is expressed in words something to the following effect:—

“But where can the line be drawn between the Chiefs who ought to take precedence over Members of Council and those who ought not? There are some 700 Chiefs and States in India and it is obviously impossible for them all to take precedence over the Members.”

In short, it is generally asked, “Where and how can a line be drawn?”

58. This problem is, it is submitted, not really so difficult to solve as it may appear to be at first sight. The complication has resulted from the recent official tendency and practice— which, it may be respectfully added, is also contrary to facts and past practice and usage— whereby the designation of certain Rulers of Indian States as “Ruling Princes” and the description of their States by the term “Principalities” have been studiously avoided which, it may incidentally be pointed out, is an instance of the manner in which the status and *izzat* of the Ruling Princes has, however unintentionally, come to be lowered.

59. From scores of old documents—official as well as historical—and indeed in the every day official correspondence of the time, it is abundantly clear that the Government in England and the Government of India themselves had until fairly recently always differentiated, and made what, it is submitted, is a necessary distinction, between the two classes of Rulers. This distinction was marked, and is still marked in the Imperial Proclamations, by applying to the higher grade of Rulers the term “Ruling Princes,” whilst the others were called “Ruling Chiefs” or “Chiefs” or by some other designations.

60. Obviously, had there been no real distinction between “Ruling Princes” and “Ruling Chiefs”, the two terms would not have been used side by side, as they frequently and quite commonly were used, because they would have been redundant and without any meaning. In this connection if we take the example of Rajputana, it will be found in *Aitchison's Treaties* Vol. III, page 2, that “there are 18 States, 1 Chiefship, and 1 Thakurate in Rajputana.” Similarly, there are a number of “minor States” and “Estates” in Central India and seven distinct classes of States in the Bombay Presidency which contains a still larger number of “petty States, Talukdaries” (the territories of “jurisdictional Talukdars”) and “Jagirs”; and some, termed “Feudatory” and “Tributary” States, in Central Provinces and Orissa respectively, and so on.

61. Thus there is a large body of Magnates who, though variously styled as Chiefs, Talukdars, Jagirdars, Feudatory Chiefs and Tributary Chiefs in the different Provinces, are independent of the Ruling Princes, and in direct political relationship of some kind or other with the British Government. Their position and comparative importance do, and should, clearly entitle them to special consideration and honour. But they cannot, it is contended, be bracketed with Rulers of the higher rank for whom the distinctive appellation of Ruling Princes was, as already pointed out, freely and expressly employed in the past not only in Imperial Proclamations and speeches of Viceroys but also irrefutably in every day official correspondence and communications.

62. To quote only a few instances where the terms Ruling “Princes” and

“Chiefs” were used : the famous Proclamation of Her late Imperial Majesty Queen Victoria is addressed to “The Princes, Chiefs, and People of India” ; in His Message to the Princes and Peoples of India on His Accession, His Imperial Majesty King George V was graciously pleased to “greet the Princes, the Ruling Chiefs and all the other dwellers in my Indian dominions” ; in the Imperial Proclamation appointing a day for the celebration in India of the solemnity of the Coronation of His Imperial Majesty, the phrase “the Princes, Chiefs, and Nobles of the Native States under Our Protection” is used ; the Royal Proclamation issued at Delhi on the 12th December, 1911, talks of “All Princes, Chiefs, and Peoples now at Delhi assembled” ; in the Message of His Imperial Majesty about the Great War in 1914, the terms “Feudatory Princes and Ruling Chiefs of India” are used ; at the Imperial Assemblage held at Delhi in 1877, Lord Lytton addressed the “Princes and Chiefs ...” ; Lord Curzon at the Delhi Durbar of 1903 said, “and here ... are gathered together in honour of the event the Princes and Chiefs and nobles” ; the despatch of Lord Canning to the Secretary of State for India, 1860, speaks of “Princes and Chiefs” and also of “every Chief ... who holds a position higher than that of a *jagirdar*” and of their “Estates” and “*jagirs*” ; whilst to cite only one instance as regards official correspondence, in the Memorandum and correspondence issued in connection with His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales’ visit to India in 1875, the terms “Native Princes and Chiefs” are frequently met with.

63. The latter-day tendency further omits very frequently even the word ‘Ruling’ before ‘Chiefs’ -- the explanation often given being that this tends to brevity ! This is a cause for further regret to the Ruling Princes and the Ruling Chiefs inasmuch as many of them – in fact almost all of them – have under them *Chiefs* of their own owing their suzerainty – as clearly defined in the official publications of the Government of India – and no further explanation appears to be called for to show that it is derogatory to our Order to designate us, *and* our fiefs and people holding positions akin to that of our fiefs, by one and the same term.* Another strong reason why this abbreviated form of the appellation is looked upon with dislike by the Ruling Princes and Ruling Chiefs is, that the association of the term brings them down to the level of Egyptian, Soudanese, Arab, Red Indian, Maori, Negro, and other Chiefs, &c., of comparatively and admittedly lower status than theirs – at least in the eyes of people of other parts of the Empire.

64. Although I am here dealing principally with the question of precedence, I would venture to urge that the claims of the higher Rulers to be re-styled in ordinary official language as Ruling *Princes* are also worthy of the early and favourable consideration and acceptance by the Government of India. As doubts have been expressed by some officials as to the use of the term “Princes” in *ordinary official correspondence* as apart from Proclamations, Speeches, &c., it will perhaps suffice to give the following quotations, in which the words to which attention is invited are printed in *italics*, but if desired many more quotations can be furnished :—

Extract from letter dated 21st December, 1860, from the Agent to the Governor-General, Rajputana, to the Secretary to the Government of India, Foreign Department.

“... His Highness who at the commencement of the outbreak” (Mutiny) “at once proceeded to his extreme border to assist us and by his courage and

*Vide para 64, page 27.

the example of his loyalty checked disaffection and gave confidence to the wavering. No Prince in Rajputana save Bikaner took the field in person, in our favour without hesitation. No Prince gave the like aid in searching out and rescuing fugitives though all gave their hospitable shelter and support, and no other Prince exhibited such purely disinterested motives in giving us his active assistance and none but the Bikaner Raja suffered so heavy a loss of Rajput kindred and *chiefs** whilst fighting purely in our cause. ... If I have exceeded the limits of my duty in bringing this case before His Excellency, the sense of justice to a faithful *ally*† ... must be my excuse. ... ”

Extracts from letter No. 2179 P, dated 5th August 1875, from the Foreign Secretary, to the Agent to the Governor-General in Rajputana, containing "orders and instructions with reference to the exchange of presents" on the occasion of the visit of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales to India.

" 4. It is probable, however, that *Princes* and *Chiefs* in whose States ... "

" 8. Except as provided in the preceding paragraphs, presents from
Princes and Chiefs are not to be offered to His Royal Highness."

Note.—In the Memorandum issued by the Foreign Office “of suggestions to meet the wishes of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales for information regarding the Native *Princes* and *Chiefs* of India” besides ‘Native *Prince*’, ‘all *Princes* and *Chiefs*’, &c., the terms ‘reigning *Chief*’, ‘reigning *family*’, and ‘dominions’ are also to be found, *vide* para 45.

65. Assuming therefore that this large number of Rulers of States and Estates, &c., is the principal difficulty in the precedence question, as well as in the way of generally reverting to the distinctive and more correct appellation of "Ruling Princes," I would venture to indicate, as a basis for further consideration and discussion, one material point upon which differential treatment could, and ought to, proceed. And it is that in cases where doubt or uncertainty exists, only the Rulers of States having the privilege of Treaties and Engagements of perpetual alliance and friendship with the British Government, or those who, while owing allegiance to the King-Emperor, are entitled to sovereign rights — however restricted — and hereditary salutes, coupled with the title of "Highness", should be held to rank as Ruling Princes and above such "high officials" of Government. By the application of this test the formidable figure of 700 will be rendered in-formidable and reduced to a very considerable extent. And as shown already, this will not be any departure from past practice.

66. I regret extremely that the question of the *izzat* of Ruling Princes and Chiefs and of precedence, together with the subsidiary points raised thereby, should have had to be dealt with at such length. But not only is the subject one of very great importance to the Members of our Order, but one the adequate representation of which appears most essential from the Imperial standpoint as well.

67. Before proceeding with other subjects, and in further support of certain statements made in the foregoing paragraphs, and of the contention that a change has gradually resulted in many things justifying the apprehensions and anxieties of the Ruling Princes and Chiefs, certain facts and extracts may advantageously be given below—portions referring to the points under discussion being printed in *italics* :—

² Vide para 68, page 26.

^f Vide para 36, pages 16 and 17.

(i) One of the last acts of the Foreign Office, before the creation of a separate Political Department, can best be illustrated by the following comparative statement which, in marked contrast with what was the case at the Rawalpindi Durbar in 1885, will shew that in spite of there being no Members of Council, the names of *all* Residents, Political Agents, and other officials of Government, and even the Staffs of the Chiefs' Colleges, were put down before those of the Ruling Princes and Chiefs attending the Higher Chiefs' College Conference at Delhi in 1913.

1913.

Proceedings of College Conference, Delhi.

“The following were present:—

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

The Hon'ble Mr. H. Sharp, C.I.E., Joint Secretary to the Government of India in the Department of Education.

Major R. L. Ricketts, Commandant, Imperial Cadet Corps.

Captain R. Chenevix-Trench Under Secretary to the Government of India in the Foreign Department—Secretary to the Conference.

1885.

Official Programme of Rawalpindi Durbar.

“The following Ruling Chiefs of the Punjab and high Officers of Government will attend the Darbar:—

H. H. the Maharaja of Patiala.

H. H. the Nawab of Bahawalpur.

H. H. the Raja of Jind.

H. H. the Raja of Nabha.

H. H. the Raja of Kapurthala.

H. H. the Raja of Faridkot.

H. H. the Raja of Chamba.

H. H. the Lieut.-Governor of the Punjab.

H. E. the Commander-in-Chief in India.

H. H. the Lieut.-Governor of the N.W. P.

Hon'ble Members of the Executive Council.

H. E. the Commander-in-Chief in Bombay.

H. E. the Commander-in-chief in Madras.”

Mr. J. Sladen, Agent to the Governor in Kathiawar.

Major W. M. P. Wood, Assistant Political Agent, Kathiawar.

Mr. J. T. Turner, Officiating Principal, Rajkumar College, Rajkot.

The Heir-apparent of the Raja of Lunavada (Kunwar Ranjitsingji).

The Chief of Miraj (Senior Branch).

His Highness the Jam of Navanagar.

His Highness the Rao of Cutch.

His Highness the Thakur Sahib of Gondal.

The Thakur Sahib of Limbdi.

The Heir-apparent of the Raja of Lunavada (Kunwar Ranjitsingji).

The Chief of Miraj (Senior Branch).

His Highness the Jam of Navanagar.

BOMBAY.

* * * CENTRAL INDIA.

The Hon'ble Mr. M. F. O'Dwyer, C.S.I., Agent to the Governor-General in Central India.

Mr. W. E. Jardine, C.I.E., Resident at Gwalior.

Lieutenant-Colonel S. H. Godfrey, C.I.E., Political Agent in Baghelkhand (represented His Highness the Maharaja of Rewa).

Mr. J. B. Wood, C.I.E., Resident at Indore.

Mr. P. Hide, Principal, Daly College, Indore.

Her Highness the Begum of Bhopal.

His Highness the Raja of Dewas (Senior Branch).

His Highness the Raja of Dhar.

His Highness the Maharaja of Gwalior.

The Rajkumar of Rajgarh (Birendra Singh).

His Highness the Raja of Sailana.

His Highness the Raja of Sitamau.

RAJPUTANA.

The Hon'ble Sir Elliot Colvin, K.C.S.I., Agent to the Governor-General in Rajputana.

His Highness the Maharaja of Alwar.

His Highness the Maharaja of Bikaner.

[Contd.]

Lieutenant-Colonel S. F. Bayley, Resident at Jaipur.	His Highness the Maharao Raja of Bundi.
Mr. R. E. Holland, Political Agent in the Eastern States of Rajputana (represented the Bharatpur Darbar).	His Highness the Maharaja Regent of Jodhpur.
Mr. W. H. J. Wilkinson, First Assistant to the Agent to the Governor-General in Rajputana.	His Highness the Maharao of Kotah."
Mr. C. W. Waddington, C.I.E., M.V.O., Principal, Mayo College, Ajmer.	

(ii) The following changes in the order of sequence and official phraseology and Seats of Durbars, &c., speak for themselves:—

Official notification of the Imperial Assemblage, 1877.

“Her Majesty the Queen ... Empress ... being desirous of seeking, from time to time, in matters of importance, the counsel and advice of the *Princes and Chiefs* of India, and of thus associating them with the paramount power in a manner honourable to themselves and advantageous to the general interests of the Empire, has authorised me ... to confer ... in her name and on her behalf, upon the undermentioned *Chiefs and High Officers of Government* the most honourable title of “Counsellor of the Empress.”

Official Programme, Coronation Durbar, 1911.

(a) DURBAR.

“... The smaller of these amphitheatres, ... for the Governors, Commander-in-Chief, Lieutenant Governors and *other high officials*, the *Ruling Chiefs* the Durbaries from British India and Native States the guests in Government Camps and privileged spectators.”

Official Programme, Coronation Durbar, 1903.

(a) STATE ENTRY.

“His Excellency will be received on arrival at the Railway Station by the *Ruling Chiefs* ... and by Governors, Lieutenant-Governors, Commander-in-Chief and the *Ordinary Members of the Council of the Governor-General*.”

(b) DURBAR.

“*Ruling Chiefs*, Heads of Local Governments and Administrations, the Commander-in-Chief, the Members of the Governor-General’s Council, and the Lieutenant-Generals of Commands will be met, on alighting, by Officers of the Foreign Department....”

“As the *Chiefs* and *High Officers* entitled to salutes enter ...”

“After the Royal cortege has left the arena, ... *Ruling Chiefs*, the Commander-in-Chief, the Members of the Governor-General’s Council ...”

(c) DEPARTURE OF VICEROY.

“His Excellency and Their Royal Highnesses will be received upon the platform by the *Ruling Chiefs*, and by all the *high officials*. ...”

(b) INSTRUCTIONS REGARDING ROUTES, PASSES, &c.

“The carriages of *High Officials* and *Ruling Chiefs* will be parked separately ...”

(c) DEPARTURE OF HIGH OFFICIALS AND *others*.

“*High Officials* and *Ruling Chiefs* will then be conducted to their carriages ...”

Official Programme of the Durbar at Rawalpindi for the reception of the Amir of Afghanistan, 1885.

“The following *Ruling Chiefs* of the Punjab and high Officers of Government will attend the Darbar:—

H. H. the Maharaja of Patiala.	H. H. the Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab.
H. H. the Nawab of Bahawalpur.	H. E. the Commander-in-Chief in India.
H. H. the Raja of Jind.	H. H. the Lieutenant-Governor of the N.W.P.
H. H. the Raja of Nabha.	Hon'ble Members of the Executive Council.
H. H. the Raja of Kapurthala.	H. E. the Commander-in-Chief in Bombay.
H. H. the Raja of Faridkot.	H. E. the Commander-in-Chief in Madras.”
H. H. the Raja of Chamba.	

Official Programme of the State arrival of Their Excellencies the Viceroy and Lady Hardinge at Delhi, on the 23rd December, 1912.

“Their Excellencies will be received on arrival by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab, ... His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief ... the Ordinary Members of the Governor-General's Executive Council, the *Chiefs* present in Delhi ...”

Seats at Durbars.

Official Programme, Rawalpindi Durbar, 1885.

“The seats in the Darbar will be arranged as follows:—On the Dais, at the right hand of His Excellency the Viceroy, will be reserved a State chair for His Highness the Amir. ... On the Dais to the left of the Viceroy will be seated His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught, and below him the Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab, the Commander-in-Chief in India, the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-Western Provinces, and His Highness the Maharajah of Patiala. The Hon'ble Members of the Executive Council and the Commanders-in-Chief of Bombay and Madras will occupy next alternate seats with the remaining Ruling Chiefs of the Punjab according to their rank, ...”

Extracts from Honours Gazettes.

Imperial Assemblage, 1877.

K. C. S. I.'s

“His Highness ... Raja of Kolapore.

James Fitzjames Stephen, Esquire, ... late Member of the Council of the Governor-General.

His Highness Raja ... of Dhar.

Arthur Hobhouse, Esquire, ... Ordinary Member of Council of the Governor-General.

His Highness ... Raj Sahib of Drangdra.

Edward Clive Bayley, Esquire, ... Ordinary Member of the Council of the Governor General.

His Highness the Jam, ... of Nauanagar.

Sir George ... Couper, ... Lieutenant-Governor of the North-Western Provinces.

Rear-Admiral Reginald ... Macdonald, Commander-in-Chief of Her Majesty's Naval Forces in the East Indies.

Delhi Durbar, 1903.

K. C. S. I.'s

“The Hon'ble Mr. Denzil ... Ibbetson, an Ordinary Member of the Council of the Governor-General.

Rear-Admiral Charles Carter Drury, ... Commander-in-Chief of His Majesty's Naval Forces in the East Indies.

The Hon'ble Mr. Henry ... Winterbotham, Member of the Council of the Governor of Fort St. George.

The Hon'ble Mr. James Monteith, ... Member of the Council of the Governor of Bombay.

The Hon'ble Lt.-Col. Donald Robertson, ... Resident in Mysore, and Chief Commissioner of Coorg.

[Contd.]

The Hon'ble Mr. Andrew ... Fraser, ... Chief Commissioner of the Central Provinces—President of the Police Commission.

Hugh Shakespeare Barnes, Esquire, ... Secretary to the Government of India in the Foreign Department.

Surgeon-General William Roe Hooper, ... President of the Medical Board at the India Office.

Colonel Sir Colin Campbell Scott-Moncrieff, ... President of the Indian Irrigation Commission.

His Highness Raja Kirti Sah of Tehri, Garhwal.
Kunwar Rambir Singh of Patiala."

HONOURS GAZETTE DATED 9TH NOVEMBER,
1901.

K.C.S.I.'s

"James John Digges LaTouche, Esquire, Senior Member of the Board of Revenue, North-Western Provinces and Oudh.

His Highness Raja Surindar Bikram Prakash Bahadur, of Sirmur.

Sultan Ahmad bin Fadhl of Lahej." *

(iii) It has been noticed that, in view of the importance attached in the States to the inviolable adherence to Treaties and Engagements between the British Government and our States, and no less in Imperial interests as well, letters of former Governors-General, on their assuming and relinquishing office, addressed to the Ruling Princes, invariably gave assurances about the maintenance of Treaty obligations and Engagements, whereas the phraseology in similar present day *Kharitas*, after undergoing some intermediate changes, has been considerably altered, as extracts from the following *Kharitas* to the Maharajahs of Bikaner will illustrate :—

Dated the 7th March, 1836.
From Lord Auckland
on his arrival.

Dated the 3rd May, 1872.
From Lord Northbrook
on his arrival.

Dated the 24th January, 1899:
From Lord Curzon
on his arrival.

"Her Majesty the Queen having appointed me Viceroy and Governor General of India in succession to the late Earl of Mayo, I have to inform you that I arrived at Calcutta on the third of May 1872 and assumed charge of my office from Baron Napier ...

"Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen Empress of India, having appointed me to be Viceroy and Governor-General of India in succession to the Right Honourable the Earl of Elgin and Kincardine. I write to inform Your Highness that I assumed charge of my office on the 6th January, 1899.

[Contd.]

* Recently the Sultan of Lahej who died of wounds received in action against the Turks near Aden was, in an official *communiqué*, described as an "Ally" (vide the *Pioneer* of the 21st July, 1915.).

You may be assured that I am cordially disposed to maintain the relations of Harmony and Friendship subsisting between the two States, to establish the utmost degree of individual friendship with you, and to seek the confidence of all the States and Chiefs of Hindoostan and the Deccan by a scrupulous adherence to subsisting engagements and to the obligations of public faith and Honor."

I hope that the friendly relations which have so long subsisted between your State and the British Government will continue to be strengthened during my tenure of office.

You may rely on my sincere wish for the prosperity of yourself, State, and of the people over whom you rule.

I beg to renew the friendly assurances which have been given by my predecessors."

The affairs of the Native States of India will receive my special care, as has been the case with my illustrious predecessors, and Your Highness may rest assured that I shall always take a deep interest in all matters which concern Your Highness and your State.

With earnest wishes for the prosperity of yourself and your people

Dated the 1st May, 1876.

From Lord Lytton
on his arrival.

"Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen having appointed me Viceroy and Governor-General of India in succession to the Right Hon'ble Lord Northbrook, I have to inform you that I arrived at Calcutta on the 12th day of April 1876, and assumed charge of the Office.

You may rely on my friendly sentiments towards yourself, and my earnest wish for the prosperity of your State and the people over whom you rule, and I trust that during the term of my official tenure, the spirit of friendliness and loyal co-operation which has marked the relations of the State of Bikaner with the British Government, may continue to be manifested."

Dated the 21st January, 1885.

From Lord Dufferin
on his arrival.

"Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen-Empress of India having appointed me Viceroy and Governor-General of India, in succession to the Most Honourable the Marquis of Ripon, I have the honour to inform Your Highness that I arrived at Calcutta and assumed charge of my office on the 13th Ultimo.

It is my earnest desire that the friendly relations which have so long existed between your State and the British Government may, during my tenure of office, be preserved and strengthened.

Your Highness may reckon on my sentiments of friendship towards yourself and my sincere wishes for the continued welfare and prosperity of your State.

I beg to renew the friendly assurances given by my predecessors in office."

Dated the 24th February, 1835.
From Lord William Bentinck
on his departure.

It is a source of great satisfaction for me to reflect that during my residence in India the intimate connection which happily subsists between you and the Honorable Company has been strengthened and confirmed, and of no less gratification to know that in my successor you will experience the same disposition to cultivate and improve the existing harmony and good understanding between the two Governments, and an inviolable adherence to the engagements by which you and the Honorable Company are indissolubly connected.

You may be assured that no distance of time, nor local situation will impair the sentiments of personal respect and esteem which I entertain towards you, or diminish my solicitude for the continuance of your prosperity, happiness and welfare."

Dated the 3rd June, 1882.
From Lord Lytton
on his departure.

I thank you for the friendship which you have shewn towards the British Government during my tenure of office, and I hope that the friendly relations, which have so long continued with benefit to your State and to the British Government, will be strengthened under my successor, the Most Noble the Marquis of Ripon.

I beg to assure you of my sincere wishes for the increased prosperity of your country."

NOTE.—The *Kharita*, dated 12th April 1876, from Lord Northbrook, on his departure, contains paragraphs exactly identical with those quoted above from Lord Lytton's *Kharita* and consequently Lord Northbrook's letter has not been shown separately, it being considered desirable to give preference to Lord Lytton's *Kharita* as having been written after the assumption by the Sovereign of the title of "Empress of India."

From Lord Elgin
on his departure.

The affairs of the Native States in India have received my special attention and care, and Your Highness, whose personal friendship I have had the fortune to make, knows the interest I have ever taken in the welfare of Bikaner.

My direct connection with this country will now be severed, but I shall continue to watch with personal interest and solicitude Your Highness's career and the progress of your State, the high charge of which has so recently been placed in your hands.

With earnest wishes for the prosperity of yourself and your people,

Dated the 13th November, 1905

From Lord Curzon
on his departure.

Having had the pleasure of Your Highness' personal acquaintance, I have taken the keenest interest in the welfare of Your Highness and Bikaner, and I am delighted to find that Your Highness' zeal and energy are being devoted with so much success to the enlightened administration of your State. The services rendered to the Indian Empire by the Bikaner Imperial Service Troops, in which Your Highness takes so soldierly an interest, have been acknowledged on more than one occasion.

Though my official connection with India will now be severed, Your Highness may rest assured that I shall not cease to take an interest in all that concerns the prosperity of Your Highness and Bikaner.

It is with the sincerest good wishes for yourself and your country that I subscribe myself, ...

Dated the 22nd November, 1910.

From Lord Minto
on his departure.

* * * *

The affairs of the Native States in India have received my special attention and care, and your Highness, whose personal friendship I have had the good fortune to enjoy, knows the interest I have taken in the welfare of Bikaner.

I have observed with satisfaction the sound and progressive lines on which the administration of your State is being conducted, and I trust that the mutual confidence which has existed during my tenure of office between the Bikaner State and the British Government may be preserved and strengthened.

It was especially gratifying to me to receive Your Highness' valuable advice and loyal co-operation in the suppression of sedition. * * *

Although my official connection with this country will now be severed, I shall continue to watch with personal interest and solicitude Your Highness' career and the progress of your State.

(iv) The degree of attention paid to the dignity and position of Ruling Princes even 30 or 40 years ago can be gauged by the most elaborate courtesies extended, and ceremonial procedure observed, during the visit to India of His late Imperial Majesty, when Prince of Wales. For instance, apart from special guards of honour being provided, which presented arms as each of "Their Highnesses passed into the Chapter Tent" on the occasion of the Investiture at Calcutta in December, 1875, and the special care devoted to each Prince being properly received on arrival, and seen into his carriage on departure, by officials, *salutes in their honour were specially fired "after the admonition had been addressed by His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales to the newly invested Knights-Grand-Commanders."* Nowadays it appears to be the tendency of some officials whenever possible to dispense with even the salutes, which, whilst causing only a slight expenditure to Government and a little personal inconvenience to the Batteries concerned, are much valued by the Ruling Princes and Chiefs as enhancing their prestige in the eyes of the Public. On the other hand, salutes for high British officials seem to be invariably fired. And I have in mind a case which caused no small amount of regret and disappointment to those Ruling Princes, who at the special invitation of the Government of India, attended the Higher Chiefs' College Conference at Delhi in, perhaps, 1913. For, whilst we were officially intimated in writing before we went to Delhi that "owing to great difficulties in the way of arranging for any ceremonials the Government of India propose to treat the visits of Chiefs to Delhi for the Conference as purely private and informal and to grant no honours or salutes," yet, it so happened that the Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab was at the time staying at Viceregal Lodge, also on a private visit, on whose departure, and whilst we were all still there, his salute was actually fired, apparently no "great difficulties" being experienced by the other Government departments responsible for arranging this courtesy to His Honour, and the same was probably the case on the

Lieutenant-Governor's arrival. And yet again, in contrast with the official Foreign Office arrangements, those Ruling Princes who had the honour of staying with His Excellency the Viceroy at the time were accorded all the customary courtesies due, in the way of Members of the Viceregal Staff receiving them on the occasion of their arrival and escorting them to the station on their departure, &c.

(v) Another peculiar official tendency, which though happily not evident now, was markedly noticeable not many years ago and is deserving of mention, if only to show that excessive zeal for the preservation of official prestige, and the dread of using terms and phrases (even though already applied in the past) likely to impair the position or the *izzat* of the Government of India, whilst serving no useful purpose, have only resulted in causing us great dejection and disappointment. Whereas a public servant in the Civil and Military services often publicly receives the thanks not only of Parliament but we believe also of the Sovereign, and although former Viceroys in official *Kharitas* had thanked Ruling Princes for their loyalty, friendship, and services to the British Government, the use of the term 'thanks' appears to have been considered *infra dig* and at that period generally substituted by 'acknowledgment,' even where the services rendered by a State were out of the ordinary, such as the despatch of its troops to fight for the Sovereign. Similarly the term 'friendship' as applied to the British Government is severely discountenanced although we have been very highly honoured by such an expression having been used even by the Sovereigns, in addition to its frequent application by Viceroys in official letters. There is a letter, which shall ever be one of our most cherished and priceless heirlooms in the State, written by the Secretary of State by command of Her Imperial Majesty Queen Victoria to my Ancestor in recognition of his services in the Mutiny, and which was received with the very greatest honour and ceremonial by His late Highness Maharajah Sirdar Singhji, and together with a *Khilat* and a *Sanad* conveying the grant of extra territory, was presented at a public Durbar by Captain Hamilton, then Assistant to the Agent to the Governor-General in Rajputana. The following extract from this letter may be quoted :—

"I have been honoured with the Commands of the Queen ... to acknowledge the receipt of your Highness' letter. ... Her Majesty is deeply sensible of the loyalty and devotion displayed by your Highness during the recent period of trouble in India, and highly appreciates the assistance which you rendered to her Army and to her Government. It is in such times that the true quality of friendship is best tested and it will ever be among the most cherished recollections of Her Majesty that Your Highness and other princely representatives of the ancient houses of Rajpootana were, during the eventful years which have just passed, amongst the most steadfast of her friends."

On the occasion of the visit, as Prince of Wales, to Bikaner in 1905, of His Imperial Majesty the present King-Emperor I personally was also similarly greatly honoured by the Sovereign Who said in His gracious Banquet speech, "In conclusion I wish to deliver the message of friendship and good wishes to yourself and your State from the King-Emperor ... " And the same, in spite of certain official notions, can be said to have been the case in the time of the Moghul Emperors, who honoured my Ancestors by using the most honourable and gratifying terms and phrases in several *Furmans* and autograph letters, while Akbar the Great in a *Farman* wrote in specific terms to my Ancestor—Raja Rai Singhji—of his "services of friendship" when the latter was in command of an expedition to

Malwa. Some of the other phrases used are 'the select of the country'; 'pillar of the great Empire'; 'deserving of obligations and favours'; 'the right hand of the Empire'; 'deserving of various and endless favours'; 'the distinguished amongst his compeers and colleagues'; 'noble'; 'brave'; 'honourable'; and 'trustworthy.' In some of the autograph letters even good natured 'chaff' and kindly jokes are indulged in.

(vi) Whilst no difference was formerly made in regard to ceremonials and honours in the case of minor Ruling Princes, it is only since the commencement of the present century that a tendency has been noticeable to treat such minors as Rulers not from the date of their accession but after they actually come of age. In some cases now no exchange of visits takes place at all and in others the visit is not returned, both of which appear formerly to have been invariably done. During my own minority, Lord Lansdowne returned my visit at Ajmer in 1890, although I was then only 10 years old and studying at the Mayo College, whilst in 1896 on the occasion of his visit to Bikaner, Lord Elgin also returned my visit with full ceremonial.

(vii) India specially is a land of high language where, as is known, two distinct sets of phraseology exist: one for people of the higher classes and the other for the lower, where, more than in any other country, the greatest attention is paid to the use of suitable appellations, and where any departure from the prescribed form or proper language is deeply resented. Our fears and dismay can therefore be better imagined than described when we noted the various differences made in the contents of the old and the new *Imperial Gazetteers of India* where, through, what, I may be pardoned for stating, can only be described as, the pettiness of certain officials, the old phraseology, *actually used*, only towards the end of the last century, *by the Government themselves* was, within 22 years, changed. Not to speak of higher and more honourable terms, even such very commonplace words as 'Dynasty,' 'Principality,' 'friendly,' and 'Government' were grudged us, whilst a treaty of *alliance* was altered into the word 'agreement' and the term 'full *governing* powers' changed into 'full powers'—both of which last named terms having been applied to a Ruling Prince alive at the present moment. The following few practical illustrations, taken at random from only a few volumes, will show in a clear way how our *izzat* and position has suffered, and how instead of generous and liberal treatment at the hands of the Imperial Government, we have been subjected by some of its officers to what has more than once been described in the past by various persons as 'petty pin-pricks' and 'unnecessary annoyances'.

THE IMPERIAL GAZETTEER OF INDIA.

1886.

1907-08.

Bhopal.

The Bhopal *dynasty* was founded by ... (Vol. II, 103).

The founder of the Bhopal *family* was... (Vol. VIII, p. 128).

Jind.

principality, which is one of the Phulkian ... (Vol. VII, p. 232).

The history of Jind as a separate *State* ... (Vol. XIV, p. 166).

1886.

1807-08.

Bhopal.

... British Government formed a close alliance with Bhopal.

... the State of Bhopal was the only Indian power which showed itself friendly; ... (Vol. II, p. 404).

... an agreement was made ... (Vol. VIII, p. 130)

... the Bhopal officials treated the British with the greatest confidence and hospitality, furnishing them with supplies and giving every possible assistance ... (Vol. VIII, p. 129).

Udaipur.

... Princess Kishna Kuar of Udaipur, ... (Vol. XIII, p. 407).

... Rana's daughter Krishna Kunwari. (Vol. XXIV, p. 92).

Jaipur.

... was invested with full governing powers. (Vol. VII, p. 57).

... was invested with full powers ... (Vol. XIII, p. 387).

Jodhpur.

... tribute ... paid over to the Jodhpur Government. (Vol. VII, p. 242).

... pay a small tribute ... to the Jodhpur Durbar ... (p. 193, Provincial Series, Rajputana).

Tonk.

... the Marquis of Hastings ... offered Amir Khan the sovereignty of ... (Vol. XIII, p. 337).

He (Amir Khan) received, however, the offer of a guarantee of all the lands ... (p. 298, Provincial Series, Rajputana).

Udipur.

... the sovereignty of Chittor was given to the younger branch ... (Vol. XIII, p. 403).

... was declared heir-apparent, and received the title of Rana, ... (Vol. XXIV, p. 88).

Jai almer.

The reign of Rawal Sabal Singh marks an epoch in Bhati History, for this prince ... (Vol. VII, p. 67).

Sabal Singh, who began to rule about 1650, was the first of the Bhati Chiefs ... (Vol. XI p. 3).

... Maharawal Bairi Sal ... came to the throne.* (Vol. VII, p. 68).

... succeeded by his younger brother, Bairi Sal. (Vol. XIV, p. 4).

Jaipur.

Jey Singh II., who ascended the Throne* ... (Vol. VII, p. 56).

He (Jey Singh) succeeded to the Gaddi* ... (Vol. XIII, p. 385-86).

*Note:—In his Despatch to the Secretary of State for India, dated 30th April, 1860, Lord Canning, speaking of the then Maharajah of Gwalior also says, "The present Maharaja, then a child, was placed upon his throne and confirmed in the possession of it by Lord Ellenborough in person."

It may respectfully also be added, in view of the present punctilious avoidance by officials of the word 'Throne' and their invariably substituting the terms 'Gaddi' and 'Masnad', even in English official papers, that the English meaning or translation of the word "Gaddi" or "Masnad" is "a Sovereign's Throne" so that both terms mean one and the same thing, and that the Hindu word 'Singhasan' and the Mohammedan word 'Takht' are given as the meaning or translation of the English word 'Throne' in *Forbes' Hindustani Dictionary*.

At the conclusion of our vernacular *Kharitas* to officials of Government when giving the date, the term employed for the Capital of the State is sometimes "Pai Takht," which literally means "at the foot of the Throne".

Nor, like Throne, is *Gaddi* the sole monopoly of Sovereigns and Rulers. Amongst others, like an Archbishop who is believed to be entitled to his own Throne, a big *Mahant* or high priest has his own *Gaddi* even in our own States.

(viii) Some years ago a circular letter was shown us stating in effect that when Rulers of States happen to be visiting the Head-Quarters of Local Governments, they should have the courtesy to call on Governors and Lieutenant-Governors even where no official visits were exchanged. We are only too pleased to show respect and courtesy to the Rulers of British Provinces but this courtesy, obligation, and arrangement ought not to be one-sided. If it is necessary or desirable for a Ruling Prince to call personally, or leave his card in person, then it should surely be incumbent on such high officials also punctiliously and similarly to return such informal visits *in person*; but in some instances cards have been sent not only by an A.-D.-C. but even by a *Chaprasi*, and at times no notice was taken at all. If, however, both sides ultimately resort to exchanging cards through *Chaprasis*, such exchange of mutual courtesy will only end in a farce.

(ix) It is understood that during the Rawalpindi Durbar of 1885 some (of the 17 gun ?) Princes received the compliment of deputations from His Excellency the Viceroy for *Mizaj Pursi* ceremony – to enquire after their health. So far as is known, no *Mizaj Pursi* ceremony recently took place on the occasion of State visits of any of the Ruling Princes to Agra, during the visit of the present Amir in 1907, and such other places. It would also be interesting to see if the ceremony of *Mizaj Pursi* on the part of the Viceroy also – it invariably takes place on the part of the Ruling Princes – was universal in the old days and, if so, for what reasons has it now been discontinued ?

Heirs, sons, and other near relations of Ruling Princes and Chiefs.

68. Side by side with the plea for rigid care being exercised in scrupulously maintaining and upholding the honour and dignity of Ruling Princes, might the case of the sons and daughters, and specially of heirs-apparent, of the Ruling Princes be also urged, for some recognition as well as suitable definition of their official position and status. At present, they seem, generally speaking, to have no acknowledged seat at Durbars and other State ceremonials when outside their States; nor is their claim to a courtesy-title of "Highness" officially recognised by the Government of India. A few years ago, His Imperial Majesty was graciously pleased to direct that the Son and Heir of Rajah Brooke of Sarawak should be given the courtesy-title of His Highness and that at the Imperial Court he should take precedence immediately after the sons of the Ruling Princes of India. The sons and daughters of the Peers of the British Realm have also their recognised title, status, and precedence. It has been said that such distinction in the case of the sons or heirs-apparent of Ruling Princes and Chiefs will be unacceptable to the Rulers themselves. Whilst this is correct in regard to a certain number, it is equally correct to state that the demand for some such official recognition and distinction for their sons, and even heirs-presumptive, has been unmistakably apparent in recent years. It is, it is submitted, a distinct hardship to deny this to the near relations of such Rulers, when the latter not only have no objection but themselves wish to see such distinction and recognition conferred on them by the Sovereign, simply because in certain States the idea is not welcome. No compulsion or universal application for the use of these titles, or for the recognition of such status and position, is advocated. But it is respectfully submitted that whilst leaving it to the option of the Rulers of States, it would be a gracious act for such distinctions to be officially and formally recognized by the Government of India where a clear desire to that effect is expressed. It is not considered necessary to write on the question at greater length, nor is it proposed that the usual distinctions, such as *Maharaj Kumar*, *Nawabzada*, &c., should be altered.

or clearly accepted. Sport, big and small, in so many States has been absolutely ruined, due either to the removal of *all* restrictions and game laws, or to the *universal* and careless grant of permission to shoot, taking years of preservation and stringent measures, after a minority, to restore things to their former condition and at times even rendering such a result impossible.

(12) All such and other important measures which, without harm, can be postponed, should be left for the Prince to adopt or reject, or if a change is rendered absolutely essential for any reasons, full power should be reserved for the Prince to reconsider the question and to continue or alter it at his discretion, when he comes of age.

Council of Princes.

76. In January 1914, I had the honour of submitting a Minute in which the formation of a Council of Princes was strongly urged and the subject dealt with in a fairly exhaustive manner. It would, therefore, be superfluous to say much on the subject here, and a copy is appended of my Minute with which are also printed the speeches of His Excellency the Viceroy and one on behalf of the Ruling Princes at the Higher Chiefs' College Conference held at Delhi in March, 1914, and extracts from certain sections of the Press.

77. Towards the conclusion of his speech at the opening of that Conference, His Excellency said, "I mention it here as an indication of my desire to treat Your Highnesses as my trusted colleagues and to seek your collective opinion, whenever possible, on matters affecting the interests of your Order."

78. On that occasion I had the privilege, at the request and on behalf of the Ruling Princes present, of expressing our gratitude to His Excellency the Viceroy for the unmistakable manner in which he had in his speech again expressed his sympathy and solicitude in matters affecting our States and ourselves and for his alluding to us as His Excellency's "trusted colleagues"—a reference, which, we said, was both gratifying and encouraging to us. I also added that it was His Excellency Lord Hardinge who, by such conferences, had given practical effect to the great idea of the Ruling Princes and Chiefs being colleagues and partners in the Administration of India, and had sown the seed of that organic connection with the Government of India which partnership involves. After voicing "the expressed wishes of my brother Princes, not only those who are present but also of others who are absent", the hope was confidently expressed that before long similar meetings would be convened "to deal with other subjects, *in which we and the States we represent are no less closely concerned*, than in this one of the College, and on which our deliberations will not only be of the greatest advantage to ourselves, our States, and our people, but also, we hope, of some value to the Imperial Government, since we represent one-third of the great Indian Empire and one-fourth of its entire population, and can, therefore, claim to be the exponents of a considerable proportion of Indian thought and influence. We feel that such consultations together are essential and for the benefit of our people and we would highly appreciate the honour if Your Excellency, as the Representative of our beloved King-Emperor, would now convene us to meet at stated intervals and to put our business on a regular and proper basis." It was further stated in this speech that India before our very eyes was developing most rapidly and that we were at our States should not be left behind, that there were no more loyal a Empire than the people of our States, and that we felt sure that in for their benefit, we would have the support not only of His

Excellency but of all British subjects in this land, who have at heart the welfare of India and of Indians as a whole. And the concluding portion of the speech read as follows :—

“ His Imperial Majesty the King-Emperor Himself, before leaving India gave us a message of hope. May we not cherish the idea that our present hope will be fulfilled ? ”

79. In his reply offering his thanks for the words spoken, His Excellency the Viceroy was pleased to say, “ I can assure you that the ideas therein expressed by His Highness the Maharajah of Bikaner have my warm sympathy.”

80. Two of the leading newspapers in India—the *Pioneer* and the *Times of India*—commented very favourably on the subject. The *Pioneer*, on the 11th March, 1914, remarked :—

“ In these days of political aspirations in India, there is a tendency in some quarters to overlook the Native States altogether and to forget that their Rulers have a deep interest in the affairs of the country as a whole. If the Chiefs now ask that there should be more consultation between the Government and themselves on matters concerning their territories directly; the request is a reasonable one. It is very likely that now and again their deliberations may be of value to the Imperial Government, for there are practical-minded men among the Ruling Chiefs, and when such meet at conferences, the results can scarcely fail to be good periodical conferences seem indicated as desirable. Lord Hardinge like his two immediate predecessors sees the advantages that may be gained by such a procedure and the only surprise is that it has not been adopted before ... ”

The following extract from the *Times of India* dated the 16th March, 1914, is also of interest :—

“ but the Conference was remarkable for a notable general pronouncement by His Highness the Maharajah of Bikaner which was subsequently endorsed by the Viceroy. The Maharajah was careful to indicate the nature of the co-operation which he desired. The Maharajah did not ask that the Chiefs should be associated with the governance of India outside their own States; he confined his plea to consultations and conferences in regard to matters concerning themselves, their States and their people. ” After stating that the idea of a Council of Princes dated from Lord Lytton’s day, and that it was revived in the scheme prepared by the Government of India which formed the basis of the Reform Act, the *Times of India* goes on to say, “ But hitherto it has been reluctantly put aside as desirable but impracticable, and it is impossible not to appreciate the validity of the objections to a scheme which has many attractions in itself. None of these difficulties, however, apply to the more modest proposal advanced by the Maharajah of Bikaner. None who appreciate the position ... will doubt the urgency of the Maharajah of Bikaner’s words. We are so obsessed by the crowded issues of the day that it is difficult to wrest our gaze free and look to the future. ”

81. In a leading article in the *Pioneer* of the 17th January, 1915, the subject has been reviewed and advocated at great length. After stating that the present War had already done much to strengthen the bond of union between the diverse elements of the British Empire, and that it had brought the ideal of Imperial Federation within the range of practical polities, the *Pioneer* said :—

“ The magnificent rally of India and the self-governing Do ... ”

to the Empire's cause gives us good grounds for hoping that when the war is happily brought to a victorious conclusion, a wise statesmanship may be able to devise a scheme of Federation which may commend itself to all the interests and sentiments involved. ... Possibly, some form of Imperial Council, representative of the constituent parts of the Empire, might be created. ... In any case some organic connection between the Government of India and the Ruling Princes of the Feudatory States would seem eminently desirable as a preliminary to India's taking her natural place in a wider federation of the Empire. It should never be forgotten that it was the Ruling Princes who set the pace as regards the participation of India in the War and gave first expression to that innate loyalty, which was afterwards re-echoed from every part of India. ... The essential thing is to make a start and to give the States a recognized voice of some kind in the Government of India before it is too late. The Congress politician with his usual indifference to the Native States and his grandiloquent visions of self-government on Colonial lines may placidly acquiesce in the prospect of the Native States being left behind and shut out altogether from the Confederation of the Empire. Not so the constructive statesman who cannot fail to recognize that they are equally entitled to consideration with the democratic element in British India, to which, indeed, they may be regarded as complementary, since, as Lord Curzon remarked
 "they represent the people of their States and speak for them in the gate." The disappointment of the Ruling Chiefs at Lord Morley's refusal to sanction their admission to any formal participation in the government of the Empire is well known to all who are closely in touch with them. It will be an ill requital of their loyalty and devotion in the present crisis, if at the conclusion of the war substantial political concessions are made to all classes and communities in British India, while the Ruling Princes as a body and the States under the protection of the King-Emperor are left out in the cold and denied the political self-expression which they crave."

82. As the Ruling Princes and Chiefs in India understand it, one of the principal obstacles in the way of the formation of a Council of Princes is the opposition which may probably be raised against the project by non-official circles in British India. To this it can be replied that all that is urged and advocated is that this Council should be created to deal *only with matters concerning the Rulers, their States, and their people*. If the Government of India is agreeable to discuss such matters with Rulers of States, and if they in their turn are willing that such matters should be discussed with them, it is clearly the concern of no one else, and any objections of a third party would be irrelevant and wide of the mark. It seems necessary to add here that it will in some ways be undesirable that other questions should be dealt with by such a Council until such time as there is a popular demand for it by the public in British India, and until the Government of India, too, considers that the time is ripe for such a course. That this time may come is not outside the bounds of possibility, in spite of the unfavourable views expressed by the *Tribune* in one of its issues of March, 1914—an extract from which is appended at the end of my previous Minute on the subject.

83. In the article entitled "Protected Princes in India," referred to in para 14, after enumerating some of the reforms prayed for by the Poona Sarvajanik Sabha, Sir David Wedderburn goes on to say, "But upon none of these radical changes is a greater stress laid than upon the claims of the native chiefs,

and their association in the councils of the Empire for the discussion of Imperial questions is strongly advocated", in which connection he gives the following quotations, (the relevant words are here shown in *italics*,) from the "Deccan Address":—

"On this occasion of great rejoicing, your most gracious Majesty's subjects would submit at the foot of your Royal throne our humble prayers and expectations, with a view that this great event might be associated in all minds with the triumphs of peace and progress, and free government, greater than any the world's proudest conquerors have enjoyed. The kind expressions of opinion contained in some of the most influential organs of the English press lead us to hope that *an effort will be made to associate the great native princes in the practical work of the administration of British India*, and that the system ... will give way to a more cordial association of them in the councils of the Empire, through some organisation of a recognised diet or assembly, where they could meet one another and the great officers and statesmen who rule India, and discuss all Imperial questions. The time has arrived for such a change. The paramount claims of the British power are unquestioned. *An Imperial Government cannot be imagined without a constitution regulating its relations with dependent sovereigns.* The germs of such an assembly already exist in many Durbar gatherings which take place from time to time. *It is only necessary to legalise what is now done informally* and as a matter of favour. Questions regarding the policy of small frontier wars with barbarous tribes, boundary disputes between native States and similar differences between British and non-British territory, the measures to be adopted with respect to rulers who misgovern their territories, questions of adoption, extradition, coinage, and of imperial legislation might be referred to such a council."

84. With reference to the remarks made in January last by the *Pioneer* about the indifference of the Congress politicians to the inclusion of the Native States into the Confederation of the Empire, the *Bengalee*—one of the prominent Indian papers in Calcutta—stated that the Congress politician "has always felt a genuine interest in the development of the Native States," that the Congress "is not indeed indifferent to the affairs of the Native States; the only Provinces in India where there is real self-government," that "the Congress politician would rejoice if a Council of Native Princes was organized for the discussion and settlement of principles affecting the government of these States and for the disposal of serious complaints made against individual rulers;" and that the *Bengalee* is "distinctly in favour of such a Council." (Vide the *Pioneer* of the 23rd January, 1915.)

85. Any objections, therefore, on the part of any politicians of British India to a Council of Princes on the lines advocated would be untenable. The question is one of vital importance to the States and their Rulers as well as their subjects; and the seriousness of the situation, and the grave dangers to us and our States of the omission to take any steps in this direction have been dealt with in my former Minute. The War has afforded a suitable opportunity for the scheme to be put into effect in a definite and practical form, and the Rulers and the people of Indian States feel that they are not appealing in vain, and that at last one of their most cherished ambitions will be fulfilled before long.

Open commissions in His Imperial Majesty's Army for the sons and relations of Ruling Princes and the aristocracy of Indian States.

86. This subject calls for very few remarks, as it has in recent years

engaged a good deal of attention. There is a general belief and expectation that after the War, practical effect will be given to this much-needed reform. Whilst it is essential that the training, both Educational and Military, should be of the highest standard and on an equal footing with that imparted to the British Officers of His Imperial Majesty's Army, and whilst the desirability for the greatest care in selecting a suitable class of cadets is fully recognised, it is respectfully submitted that the time has come for scions of Indian families to be honoured with commissions in His Imperial Majesty's Army, which will not only be graceful but have a most beneficial and far-reaching effect from the Imperial point of view as well. Whilst this question should, and must, apply to the Aristocracy of British India also, special reference is here made to it in the interests of the Indian States.

Subjects of Indian States should be eligible for the Public Services in British India.

87. Although we are gratefully aware that the question is already engaging the attention of Government, it is considered desirable specially to include this point also. The people of British India find no inconsiderable employment in our States and when the Indian States form an important part of the Empire, it seems only right and fitting that there should be no statutory bar to our subjects in regard to services under the Government of India. It is earnestly to be hoped that the proposals of the Government of India will soon be accepted by the Secretary of State.

Summary.

88. In conclusion the following summary of the proposals which I have ventured respectfully to submit may be given for the sake of convenience:—

- (1) The maintenance and upholding of the honour, dignity, privileges, and prestige of Rulers of States and thus dispelling their existing difficulties and anxieties.
- (2) Reconsideration of the existing arrangements in regard to the rank and precedence of Ruling Princes.
- (3) The official recognition of the status and position of their heirs, sons, and other near relations, and the conferment of the courtesy-title of 'Highness' in certain cases.
- (4) Certain miscellaneous proposals for improving the present system and channels of official communication between the Government of India and the States.
- (5) A definite and early pronouncement of Government views and policy in regard to certain points generally applicable to most, if not all, States in connection with the administration of States during minorities.
- (6) The formation of a Council of Princes.
- (7) Open commissions in His Imperial Majesty's Army, and
- (8) Subjects of Indian States to be eligible for the Public Services in British India.

BIKANER:

}

Ganga Singh.

20th August, 1915.

Maharajah of Bikaner.